



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114666035>

A20N
C2
990
52

Government
Publications



4 1991

C-14 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

1st Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)



Wednesday 20 February 1991

Journal
des débats
(Hansard)

Le mercredi 20 février 1991

Special committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Secretary: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 20 February 1991

The committee met at 0931 at the Western Fair Paddock, London.

The Chair: If I could call this meeting to order, we're, of course, the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, and there is a resounding echo here. We are happy to be here in London, Ontario, this morning at the Western Fair Paddock. This is our third week of hearings across the province. Earlier this week, we were in Toronto, yesterday we were in Windsor and later today we will be in Kitchener and tomorrow in Brantford and Hamilton, on a schedule that takes us throughout the various regions of the province in the four weeks of February.

We heard up until now a number of useful and fascinating ideas about the future of the country and the future of Ontario within Confederation, and no doubt we will hear today in London a number of interesting and useful presentations.

This is a committee made up of representatives of the three political parties which have people elected at Queen's Park, and I want to introduce at this point the members of the committee. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill, Steven Offer; from the Conservative caucus we have Ted Arnott and we expect Dianne Cunningham to be joining us shortly; from the NDP caucus, in addition to myself, we have Gary Malkowski, Marilyn Churley, Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee. Will Ferguson joins us today, and Ellen MacKinnon and Kimble Sutherland join us.

As we found in a number of other locations, we have in addition to the printed list a number of people who have asked to be added to the list, and we will do our best to accommodate those requests. Given the tight time lines that we have and the number of speakers that we have, we can only do that with the co-operation of all of the speakers.

I would ask you, if you are speaking as an individual, to try to keep your comments within the 10-minute mark, and within 20 minutes if you are speaking on behalf of an organization. If you could keep them within or below that amount of time, it would also give us a little bit of time to have some questions and discussion back and forth with the members of the committee. We also find that to be, quite frankly, a very useful process. If you leave us that time, we would appreciate that. If we do not have that time, we just will not be able to do it and we will have to move on to the following speaker.

LONDON INTERCOMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE

The Chair: With that, I will ask Dr Bhooma Bhayana to come forward, our first speaker. While we are waiting for Dr Bhayana to come to the table, I will just indicate to any of the subsequent speakers who have written presentations, if they wish to provide them to the clerk during the proceedings, even before they come to the table, that will

again save us some time and we can have the papers distributed before you begin speaking. Dr Bhayana, go ahead.

Dr Bhayana: Just to give you a little bit of perspective on where I am coming from, I am a family physician working at the London InterCommunity Health Centre. The InterCommunity Health Centre is a community health centre funded by the Ministry of Health, with various programs that are also funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services. We service the needs of both the multicultural population and the population in our immediate geographical area.

The people we represent, therefore, our patients and our clients, are immigrants and refugees from a number of communities, including Latin America, Poland, Iran, Ethiopia, Cambodia and the Sudan. We also represent the people in our immediate geographical area, which is—for those of you from London—Dundas and Adelaide. So we represent socioeconomically disadvantaged groups, including sole-support mothers and families, ex-psychiatric patients, the homeless in the area and others.

Our programs include: medical programs, or primary care; social work; a multicultural women's support group in various languages; a seniors' independence project; an art therapy program working with multicultural youth, seniors and other groups; a health promotion program; community outreach workers, and a variety of affiliated programming, including English as a second language for our refugees and immigrants.

The scope of problems that our patients and clients face is quite broad. The new refugees are facing the stresses of migration. They are also facing the turmoils that they have just left behind in their country, including often being victimized in situations of torture or incarceration. They also face the stresses of settlement that are involved in coming to a new culture, a new country.

Their settlement is often not completed by the year-long period that is sort of deemed as the magical time that they are allowed to have settlement workers. The period of settlement varies depending on their country of origin and the problems that they faced in coming, so often the period of settlement continues long after that magical one-year period. The problem is that after that one year, they no longer have the settlement worker, they no longer have funding for settlement work and their access to services in the community is very limited by the language barrier, so their settlement is hampered.

New refugees interface with Canadians at a number of levels, and at each of those levels they have an opportunity to see our Constitution in action. Our Constitution—and this is out of the public discussion paper—prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability, ethnic origin, race or colour and asserts that our Charter of Rights and Freedoms

will be interpreted in a manner consistent with Canada's multicultural heritage.

For the most part, their experiences have been good, but there is a big gap in the document and its day-to-day interpretation by the peoples of Canada. The problem is not so much the document; it is the interpretation and its implementation. Beyond revision of the document, its implementation in terms of raising sensitivities to the issues faced by new refugees is imperative, both in the service sector and by people in the communities where the refugees are living.

Immigrants have chosen to migrate, so it might be presumed that they face fewer stresses than the refugees in terms of political exile or persecution that they have left behind. For the most part that is true, but they have often chosen to leave a socioeconomically oppressive situation and less overt forms of oppression than refugees. It is necessary that that also be recognized in our helping them to settle. Of course, they also experience the same gap in the interpretation of the Charter of Rights by the Canadians with whom they interact.

The stressors of integration faced by new refugees and immigrants are: migration and its stress; stresses of political exile and the victimization that they have left behind; a strong sense of loss of homeland, sense of heritage and extended or nuclear family; a loss of value for their education and experience—there is a wall of Canadian experience that they have to surmount before they are able to seek employment; barriers of language and access; socioeconomic stressors, especially when compounded by the wall of Canadian experience.

They also experience quite a bit of discrimination based on ethnic origin, race or colour as outlined in the Charter of Rights, but also by country of origin in terms of the political situation and lack of understanding of their orientation by Canadians. For visible minorities, the sense of discrimination is more acute because they have a sense that even by the third or fourth generation, their children may not be able to fully integrate into the country.

I certainly have no justification to be presenting any implementation strategies or policy changes. I am basically a service provider, so I can tell you what we see, but my feeling is that beyond constitutional revisions, there needs to be a need to implement the Constitution as it is. There needs to be a bridging of the gap between the document and the words and the actual service provision and the raising of sensitivities of Canadians.

0940

Education to raise the sensitivities of Canadians is important. I do not think most Canadians know what the difference between a refugee and an immigrant is or what sort of problems refugees face in coming here.

Programs to help refugees and immigrants have their skills recognized and thus integrate into the workforce at a level in keeping with their own training would be beneficial. We can talk about equality, but until it is put into action, it means very little.

Programs to assess the special needs of certain groups of newcomers so that their settlement period can be tailored to the needs rather than a blanket period of time of

one year for all newcomers would also be beneficial to their assimilation or to their integration.

In a broader term, assertion of the richness that newcomers bring to the fabric of Canada in terms that are visible not only to Canadians but also to the newcomers, to raise their sense of self-esteem as they come here, would be beneficial.

Finally, we need actualization in practice of policies show our welcoming stance in a very real fashion, because we can open the doors to people who seek refuge, but until we really implement it and show them that we are implementing it, it is not more than words on paper.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr Bhayana, for bringing to our attention some particular perspective that I think we need to be conscious of about newcomers to the country. There is time for some questions. Mr Malkowski to start.

Mr Malkowski: I was quite impressed with your presentation and I agree with you wholeheartedly that cultural sensitivity is very important in the educational process and that we have to give education regarding the Constitution to immigrants as well.

My question pertains to the Constitution and what you see as the most important value that people see as Canadians. Could you expand on that if possible, the value people from outside of Canada view as Canada's primary value?

Dr Bhayana: I think for our new refugees the value that they see as the most important is freedom. They have escaped an oppressive regime or escaped an oppressive economy, so the freedom to be able to express themselves, the freedom to be able to achieve their goals for their children to be educated is the value that most of our new refugees see in Canada.

For Canadians, in terms of how they interact with newcomers, I think there is a real dichotomy. We have a value for integration and for living in harmony and a value for the mosaic, but on the other hand, in the communities where refugees are living, we are finding that people also have a strong feeling that people should assimilate. There is not a clarification on how those two values really interact. I think a lot of people would like to see an American-style melting pot, whereas they are cognizant of a Canadian style mosaic.

The Chair: Just very briefly, we have one more question. Mr Offer.

Mr Offer: Dr Bhayana, thank you for your presentation. My question is really as a result of the end part of your last response, when you talk about a dichotomy of sorts within the country. That is something that this committee has heard earlier. Do you feel that one way in which we can promote the multicultural aspect not only of this province but indeed throughout the country is to look towards a so-called Canada clause which not only reflects the founding nations, anglophone, francophone and native people, but also the multicultural aspect of the country? I would like you to share with us your thoughts as to whether this type of clause, enveloping and embracing the country which Canada is now, is one which might work towards reducing this type of dichotomy of attitude.

Dr Bhayana: I think it certainly would. I think a lot of what we used to call mainstream Canadians think of as mainstream and a peripheral stream, and there needs to be recognition that the peripheral is now part of the main. We receive education on the Constitution right from grade 1, so a change in the Constitution would mean a change in education. A Canada clause would be valuable in bringing the peripheral stream into the mainstream and recognizing the multiplicity of Canada as it is now.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr Bhayana.

Dr Bhayana: Thank you.

BOB WOOD

The Chair: I call next Bob Wood. Mr Wood, go ahead.

Mr Wood: Mr Chair, members of the committee, the issue that you are studying is quickly reaching a critical age, and I suggest three concrete steps which should be taken immediately.

The first is a clear and immediate response to Quebec's Allaire report, which is to be considered by that province's Liberal Party next month. The draft that has been made public amounts to the almost complete dismantling of the federal government and the creation of a "federal" system in which no sensible Ontarian could want our province to participate. This report or anything similar to it could never be the basis for any constitutional arrangement that Ontario would agree to, and we owe it to all Canadians, including Quebecers, to make that clear now.

The Quebec Liberal Party and all Quebecers should understand that if their goal is massive decentralization or, failing that, separation, they may as well seek separation right now. It will do no one any good to have constitutional negotiations drag on for a year or more and then have all concerned realize that the whole process was a farce because the parties' respective positions were irreconcilable from day one. Such a course is a recipe for prolonged economic uncertainty and regional acrimony.

Premier Rae's response to the Allaire report has been an abdication of leadership. His comments were evasive on the issues at stake and politically incoherent. The Premier seems to be saying that every constitutional issue is open to discussion except unilateral Quebec separation. He risks becoming the Hamlet of Ontario politics, unable to decide what to do. Commentators point out that if he continues on his current course, he will make himself irrelevant to this crucial debate, and that is bad for this province.

It is time for Ontario to stand up for what we believe in and do it publicly. We can no longer rely on the Premier of Newfoundland to tell Quebec what Ontario really thinks, though he did do so again a few days ago. We must lay it on the line now that Ontario will have nothing to do with proposals like the Allaire report. It is time to stop the happy talk and start the plain speaking with Quebec. We as people must start to stand up and advocate what we believe in and stop hiding our own convictions because they might offend somebody.

This committee should recommend to the Premier that he make it clear immediately that the Allaire report cannot form the basis of any constitutional changes to which Ontario

would agree. This will inject a needed note of realism and candour into the constitutional debate and will move it on to a useful next stage.

The second step is to recommend a freeze on any further extension of bilingual services in this province until the future relationship of Quebec to the rest of Canada is clear. If the current Canadian situation of having a 25% minority francophone population becomes having a 5% francophone minority, Ontario and all the other provinces and the federal government will have to assess very carefully what French-language services should be provided. The reality is that a nine-province Canada will be an English-speaking country with a small but significant French-speaking minority. Such a Canada will not in any real sense be a bilingual country.

If Quebec separates, Ontario should continue to provide French-language services to its francophone minority, but their nature and scope should be determined after separation. Such a determination will have to take into account how Ontario can promote the things we have in common. A province or country must promote and sustain certain core values or ideas or it risks fragmentation. Any attempt by the government to extend French-language services now will show that it is totally out of touch with the thinking of the people of Ontario on this issue.

0950

The third step is to call for the creation of an Ontario commission on constitutional options. This should be a commission of non-partisan experts who will tell us the advantages and disadvantages, the feasibility and the likely form of our options. Its function should be only to define the options, not to comment on their merits. A decision on which option to take must be made ultimately by the voters themselves.

The commission should study the full gamut of options, from best case to worst case. The options are: Canada with 10 provinces; Canada with nine provinces; Ontario as an independent country, and Ontario as a state of the United States. There is, of course, the option of a Canada with fewer than nine provinces, but it need not be studied as a separate option as its merits will become apparent from study of the four options proposed.

My first preference is a 10-province Canada and my last is to see Ontario as an American state, but in a situation as serious and as uncertain as the current one, it is vital that we understand the ins and outs of all our options now. Some would say that statehood is such an unlikely—and to me unpalatable—possibility that it should not even be analysed, but I believe it should be included in the study if for no purpose other than as a comparison to other options. There is a strong possibility that Quebec will be leaving Canada, and there is no guarantee that we can successfully resolve to mutual satisfaction the real and long-standing grievances that western Canada has with us. For those reasons, we must look at all the possibilities now, unpleasant though some of them are.

The commission would provide answers to the following: Is there a politically realistic basis on which the 10 provinces can be reconciled, and what is that basis? Can the nine English-speaking provinces be reconciled, and on

what basis? Is Ontario viable as an independent country, and what political and economic relationships would a viable independence require us to have with others? On what terms, if any, might we become part of the United States, and what would be the economic, social and cultural effects of statehood?

We owe it to ourselves and all Canadians to get all the facts and possibilities on the table so that all of us can start making some sensible decisions. Quebec has spent much time and effort in defining the ins and outs of its options and we must do the same.

The fundamental problem Canada faces as a nation is that most French Quebecers, who have always considered themselves Quebecers rather than Canadians, have now concluded that it is both feasible and desirable to be politically independent. The Allaire report is further evidence that there is little possibility of finding common constitutional ground between Quebec and the other provinces. This problem is compounded by the fact that economic patterns in the west are much more north-south than they are east-west. As a number of insightful commentators have pointed out, no amount of constitutional tinkering is going to alter these basic facts.

The blunt truth is that we are on the edge of fundamental changes in the political relationships that our province has, but have done no serious analysis of the options and have not considered which of the choices are best for us.

In the past, we have tended to mute our voice for fear of offending public opinion in Quebec. That strategy has not worked and it is politically bankrupt. Now is the time for us to consider what is best for us and for all Canadians in these circumstances, and then vigorously advocate that position.

Ontario is the biggest and richest of Canada's provinces and our position or lack of one in this debate will have a major impact on its outcome. We can take the initiative and be the moulders of events or we can continue to be passive and become the victims of what happens. Nothing of lasting value or significance was ever achieved by doing nothing. The time for hesitation is through. The time for action is now.

The Chair: There are a number of people who want to ask questions. We will have time for probably just one. Mrs Cunningham.

Mr Wood: I hope this is an easy question, Dianne.

Mrs Cunningham: Actually, it is probably one that would mean a lot to the citizens of London, because the leadership, certainly in the 1960s, for the Canadian unity question probably came from John Robarts; the task force on Canadian unity was co-chaired, as your document reminds us, by our former Premier. At that time, he obviously had high hopes and expectations for Canadian unity, or I do not think he and Pepin would have worked so hard. Now I sense, certainly in your presentation today—and many of my colleagues here have spent a lot of time travelling Ontario—not the same kind of hope and aspiration. Given your excellent presentation today and ideas that, although they may be tough, we have to consider, I wonder what you see as being the main difference. As someone

coming from London who has been involved politically, I find your presentation somewhat—I guess the best word would be disappointing—not from you, because I think a lot of people feel the way you do and are looking at a different question now. What is the difference?

Mr Wood: I think the circumstances have changed. It is not pleasant to have to confront the facts that we do have to confront. I am a strong believer in Canada and what we have stood for, and the fact is we have accomplished a lot over the 124 years we have been together.

The other aspect of this, however, is that we have an unpleasant fact to confront: The people of Quebec—if you look at the polling, it is 65% to 70%—no longer want to be part of Canada. John Robarts, who was indeed a great nation-builder, was prepared to face facts and deal with them. His position shifted significantly from the time he was Premier until the time the Robarts-Pepin report came out, and that was because he saw that realities had changed. I would suggest that there has been a greater shift in the last 10 years, and if John Robarts were alive today, I think he would be the first to say, "Take a look at what you've got and make the best of it."

Having been negative about the prospects of reconciliation with Quebec, no one is more positive than I am about the future of this province and the other parts of Canada, indeed including Quebec. However, I think we have to face the fact that we are going to have to make major changes. We have to look at our options objectively and decide what is best for ourselves as Ontarians and for all Canadians. I do not think it is in any way negative to take what we have and try and make it better, and that is really what we have to do.

One thing I would urge all of us not to do, and it is not easy: Let's not be ostriches about this. We cannot pretend that things are okay, that a few adjustments are going to fix this problem. There is a fundamental problem we have to address and come to the right conclusions, and that indeed is what the Fathers of Confederation did in 1867. They had a political system that did not work, they found one that did work and implemented it, and that is what we have to do now.

Mr Winninger: I know, Mr Wood, that you have come in your personal capacity.

Mr Wood: I hope, Dave, this is an easier question than Dianne's.

Mr Winninger: I am sure it will be. I know you are speaking in your own personal capacity and not as a representative of the Conservative Party here. When you characterize Premier Rae as the Hamlet of Ontario politics, would ask you this: Is it not better for the Premier to keep his options open while he is hearing the wishes of the people than to take an intransigent and inflexible stand like the premiers did during the Meech Lake process? We have all seen that that kind of executive federalism failed. Is it not better to take the flexible approach Premier Rae is taking now than to take a strong position from which he may want to change later?

Mr Wood: I do not think you are ever wrong in taking a strong stand on a question of principle right up front.

ink the Premier is quite wrong in saying that everything open to discussion. The Allaire report, as far as I am concerned and as far as the people of Ontario are concerned, is not open to discussion. We would never participate in such a proposal.

Mr Winninger: I know the Premier said that Canada not up for negotiation.

000

The Chair: I was actually going to comment on that. I am going to wait until the end of the questions. I think the Premier, as I have heard him speak, has made it quite clear that he is certainly open to various kinds of discussions around the restructuring of federal-provincial powers, but I think he has also been quite clear in saying that as far as he is concerned, Canada is not up for discussion itself as a country. I think he has been trying to allow the process of consultation to evolve and in fact shape the kinds of decisions that he and the government of Ontario will take. I hear what you are saying in terms of where your position is on that; that is fair.

Mr Wood: I do hope this committee will, despite the fact that it sounds partisan—David and I love to get into partisan discussions, which are lots of fun, but I am also making a serious point. I think the Premier is seriously wrong in being as flexible as he is. I think we have to put some of our positions on the table now. We have to stand up for what we believe in. We have to make that crystal clear.

The Chair: I think we hear that, Mr Wood, and I think that is something the committee is going to have to grapple with as well. I suspect, in fact, that we are going to be ready to come to at least some general kinds of directions we might want to put forward, but that obviously is up to the committee in the end, that the end of the process of discussion, all consultation—

Mr Wood: Tell the Premier to stand up for Ontario now.

The Chair: I think he has been doing that. Anyway, there is not much point in belabouring that between the two of us. We will carry on. Thank you very much.

Mr Wood: My pleasure.

HILLARY EDWARD

The Chair: I will go on to the next speaker, Hillary Edward. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Edward: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the committee. You have my name, and, just as a matter of interest, I am a native son of Brantford, just down the highway. I hope I can get through what I have to say in the time allotted, which seems rather an inadequate time in which to develop such a profound subject as Ontario's future in Confederation, including such topics as bilingualism, abortion, capital punishment, immigration, the Quebec problem, our aboriginals, the Supreme Court, the Bank of Canada, Parliament and others. Unfortunately, therefore, I am able to discuss only one of these, which I regard as vital. In any event, thank you for the opportunity to make these few remarks.

One would assume from the title of your body that its mandate and function would be one of inquiry, that is, ascertaining the political feelings of the populace. Contrary to that expectation, however, from all media reports you have become and instrument of advocacy and intervention. In your Sault Ste Marie meeting, the Chairman said the council chambers had been made a symbol of intolerance for many French Canadians, and that by the medium of that meeting, "You were sending out your own signal."

I would like to remind you that prior to the Sault council and many others declaring for English in the conduct of their affairs, which they were entitled to do, the Quebec government passed Bills 101 and 178 which effectively made Quebec unilingually French, with harsh penalties for non-compliance—a clear symbol of intolerance to the rest of Canada. I remind you, too, that our Bill 8 was railroaded through the Ontario Legislature with only 55 of the 130 members present. This has been represented as being passed "unanimously," which is a complete fraud.

I remind you that only 4.6% of Ontario's population claims to be French, half of which are estimated to use English in daily life. Of course, they do have the rights available to all of us, but why the 95.4% should turn hand-springs for them defies the imagination. A long list of expenditures by the last government includes the item for \$1 million to help francophones celebrate the coming into force of Bill 8, \$4 million to study—another study—the needs of francophones for day care, as if they are some exotic people whose needs are any different from ours, and \$70 million for little old TV La chaine.

The "me first" demands of Quebec have been a pain in the Canadian neck for many years and have spilled over into Ontario. Small cadres of French come into an area, quickly demanding duplicate services in French, which the rest of us are expected to pay for. They now have their schools, radio and TV stations, all duplicating what is already available, and who is doing most of the paying for all that? If the 4.6% had to pay for everything they are demanding, it would not be there. In driving to Montreal, passing along Highway 401 at the eastern end of Ontario, as probably many of you know, it has many French signs. Once the border is crossed there is not a sign in English to be seen.

To digress for a moment, I happened to live for 20 years in the Orillia area. During that time, the ruckus in Penetang was taking place. A group of activists came in there from Hull, Quebec, and started stirring up the population of Penetang, which was about half French and half English. The French community became divided down the middle through this. The high school there was a joint English-French high school and a very successful one. These people did not rest until they had fouled up that situation of racial harmony, and they obtained their own high school, with all the accoutrements of a high school, at a cost to us taxpayers of between \$8 million and \$10 million for about 150 pupils, which economically just does not make any sense at all.

Getting back to my script, the 95.4% of us have had enough. If your neophyte government is thinking official bilingualism, it would be well advised to think again. It is

a disaster in Canada outside Quebec, which of course is not bothered with two languages. Polls continually show 70% to 80% opposed to this official bilingualism, which is forced bilingualism—racist, divisive and very costly. The federal government alone spent \$1.4 billion on official bilingualism last year, trying to push this at people who do not want it. No government has a mandate to dictate to the populace what language it may or must speak. Otherwise, we have lost our freedom of choice. It is predictable that if the climate of official bilingualism persists, the bastardization of languages will result in all of us becoming illiterate in both official languages, as hapless New Brunswick has become. If you do not believe me, ask anybody who has lived in New Brunswick.

Finally, some clarification for the record on the Brockville flag incident, so-called, when the fleur-de-lis was walked on. Thanks to the CBC, it was revealed that the perpetrators of the act were two former Québécois disenchanted by the dictatorial regime existing there, who, wanting to register their disgust, unfortunately infiltrated a meeting of a decent, upfront organization which had no responsibility for the incident whatever. Predictably, the uproar in Quebec was something to behold. The film clip was run almost non-stop and distributed abroad. All of this was in spite of the fact that the Canadian flag had, on several occasions previously, been burned and otherwise desecrated in Quebec. This, of course, received little publicity, reflecting the clash of two differing mentalities, which are probably irreconcilable.

Great changes in our political landscape are in the offing. A strong movement is afoot towards a demand for binding referendums on questions of national interest, plus recall of MPs and MPPs who do not reflect the majority views of their constituents. You can be here today and gone tomorrow.

1010

Just as a postscript to that, I want to tell you that I am not anti-French and I am not anti-Quebec. I happen to have family in Quebec still. I had a sister in Quebec, from a very prominent family there, until about a year ago when unfortunately we lost her. But she had no time at all for the politics and the stance and the infighting in her own home province, and she was French Canadian.

The Chair: There is time for one question. Before I turn to Mr Beer, let me just say in response to your opening comment about the committee having become an instrument of advocacy that I think we have made a decision consciously as a committee that we would be as honest as we could be with the public, the people who were appearing before us, in those areas where we had some views. I think we felt it was better to be clear about that, to be upfront with that, because that, in our view, would not only be more direct but more honest. Certainly that does not detract from our great interest in hearing the views of people on a variety of issues, and in fact allowing our own positions to be shaped also by the kinds of things we will be hearing.

As I said, we were very clear that in some areas we did have some positions and we thought it was best to be honest and clear about that as opposed to pretending that we were simply blank slates to be filled as we went along.

You may or may not agree with that, but that has been our approach to date and I suspect will continue to be. Mr Beer?

Mr Beer: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I simply want to put to Mr Edward that the views you express—that is why we are going around the province, to hear what people think but there are other visions, and I, for one, would have different vision regarding the place of the two languages.

Mr Edward: Naturally.

Mr Beer: And I think we, in our own way, go out and talk about this with people in our ridings; we go through elections and the like, and that is where these are debated. But when we look at the history of our country, when we look certainly at the history of this province, we have all ways had within this area of Ontario English- and French-speaking Canadians. That has been very much a part of our history. The fact that there may be injustices committed in different parts of the country against one or other of those two linguistic groups, it seems to me, does not mean we then do not have a vision where we are trying to say that we believe in a certain basic respect for linguistic rights. I would merely suggest that that is a perfectly legitimate vision, and that if this country is to continue we need to have some kind of basic respect for the two national languages of our country.

Mr Edward: That is all very well, Mr Beer, and agree completely that there should be respect for both languages, but the problem is the imposition of "official" languages. People feel it has been forced on them. It is terribly expensive, it is divisive, as I say, and racist, and it is creating a lot of trouble countrywide. As I see it, and I am sure a lot of people would agree, it is one of the great divisive forces in this country, and God only knows we have all kinds of them. This country is just fighting major contention among the populace, in my opinion, from what I can see, from what I can learn.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Edward. I think there might be some disagreement about whether bilingualism has been imposed in various parts of the province, but rather than get into a debate about that I think we will say we understand the point you are making and we realize that is an area we need to address in some fashion or other at least in the perception of it, if not in the substance of what you have suggested. But thank you for your views.

Mr Edward: Thank you.

CROSS CULTURAL LEARNER CENTRE

The Chair: Could I call next Kathleen Kevany from the Cross Cultural Learner Centre?

Ms Kevany: Although the questions recommended in the framework are fuel for much contemplation, discussion and action, I will be focusing on the two which correspond with the mandate of the Cross Cultural Learner Centre. The Cross Cultural Learner Centre exists to bring together people and resources in an environment in which individuals and groups from across the country can understand the issues of international development, particularly in the Third World, together with cross-cultural issues in Canada.

nd can act together to create a more just community both globally and locally.

In light of this area of expertise, I will address questions 1 and 3: What are the values we share in Canada and what roles should the federal, provincial and municipal governments play? I will review the values supported and the priorities actualized by Canadians historically, at present, and some recommendations regarding an approach for the future, looking at an ideal possibly.

I would like to first recommend that we not assert that our Charter of Rights and Freedoms be interpreted in a manner consistent with Canada's multicultural heritage. Historically, the reception, acceptance and integration of diverse newcomers was not welcoming, was not positive or supportive. Canada began as a segmented society where non-whites were considered inferior outsiders. Immigration practices in Canada have been discriminatory and ethnocentric. We supported this drive to remain homogeneous by arguing that others were unsuited for the adverse climatic conditions of the harsh Canadian winters.

The values exposed at this time were to work hard, develop dominion over the environment, raise a family to be respectful of traditions and populate and develop, even selectively, the vast lands of Canada. In order to fulfil these, priority was given to members of the founding cultures. Their passages were paid and acres of land given to them for cultivation. Scant efforts were made to invite non-traditional Europeans, but not much effort was made to attract other new inhabitants from other areas. Europeans were invited but others were less so.

The early Chinese labourers brought over to build the railways were charged a head tax if they wanted to remain in Canada. Any family member brought in was charged a sum most families were unable to afford, thereby effectively eliminating this population. Members from the Far Eastern areas who were received into Canada were only those who had booked a through passage from the Far East, and at that time there were very few through passages; again, another clever method of eliminating members of that part of the world.

We did invite and bring in Ukrainian and Jewish settlers, but they were destined for the untamed Prairies. In the text *None is Too Many*, Harold Troper and Irving Abella review some of the injustices evident in our immigration practices and dispel the myth that Canada was humanitarian in its policies and practices.

At this point in our development, we could say that people shared similar values, held on to similar dreams. But as the population grew and diversified, consensus became more difficult. The absence of technology complicated the sharing of information. News from regions was not quickly shared; visions were more regional than national.

The ability to reach consensus on values and visions has been greatly reduced, but we realize that if Canada is to endure it must change. A successful society develops from a shared understanding of what is acceptable, not by chasing after an unachievable consensus. Today, Canada boasts of a culturally pluralistic society, one in which the dominant group tolerates or accepts the existence of others. However, says Jean Burnet, "less effort was expended by

the Canadian governments to maintain the mosaic than was spent by governments in the United States to keep the melting pot bubbling."

Our definition of Canadian culture cannot be given statically, that is, in terms of what exists at a given point in time, without reference to the changes occurring in response to new environmental demands. An individual today is born into a particular cultural group and interacts with it, engages in a process of integrating, modifying or rejecting the established problem-solving processes. The individual, therefore, is not only shaped by, but also shapes his or her culture.

1020

The previous Canadian practice of preferring and selecting charter culture members has been modified by implementing a selection system based on points. This impartial measure gives people credit for their language skills, their education, their employability and family relations in Canada. This does not prohibit the entrance of members from any part of the world. There are imposed maximum numbers from parts of the world, but no one is told blatantly that there will be no entrance for that community.

With the increased mobility and enhanced information systems, news of other areas travels more readily. We are now able to link with family, friends and members of our own cultural groups miles away. Our present-day societal values are materialism, wealth, security, power, international peacemaker—more or less—international environmental concerns and winning over others to one's way of thinking. Values, like culture, are dynamic and have changed from those adhered to by the previous generation and will be modified yet again and again by upcoming generations.

The governments also must respond to the changing needs of the people. The policies, programs and laws must be in accordance with the needs of all members of the society, not only those most articulate. Introducing multiculturalism was a step towards ensuring the dignity of each culture, whether individual or collective dignity. In terms of an individual, this dignity would be manifest in seeing some consistency between their private identities and the "symbolic contents upheld by public authorities, embedded in the societal institutions and celebrated in public events."

The current age is one of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is more than celebrating cultural festivities. It is ensuring equal access to opportunities, equal representation in positions of power. This means diversity is not only encouraged and welcomed, it is government policy.

All levels of government must play an active role in ensuring responsible Canadian citizenry. The federal government must provide the necessary resources and direction to facilitate the wide education of rights and responsibilities as a Canadian citizen. The provincial governments must ensure that services be available to enable members to actualize their role. The municipal government also plays a crucial role in facilitating the effective development of the community and the groups within it. The benefits of an organized, educated and integrated community are far-reaching. Maintaining an openness to diversity is crucial

for sustained community development. "To label someone as essentially like oneself is to activate a label of solidarity, to recruit someone as a potential ally and simultaneously to rebuff others." All levels of government need to share the responsibility of engendering positive community relations and responsible community action.

In our ideal, sophisticated, democratic community, all members should be offered meaningful participation based on the right and duty of every citizen to scrutinize and assess things for himself or herself, to have doubts and to challenge authority. We would be proud of our diversity, one of the defining characteristics of our society. We would not be striving for one dominant philosophy nor one way of viewing the world. We would be teaching our children that together we are better, not one better than another but all valued in different ways for different things. All individuals would be trained to be responsible citizens and be actively involved in the evolution of the social environment.

It is our premise that multiculturalism needs to become everyone's business. We need to put genuine effort into the mainstreaming of the diverse cultural groups in Canada. Perhaps the question now is whether the governments are capable of fulfilling the needs of the diverse public. The composition of government bodies has not been culturally nor economically diverse. A study done by University of British Columbia researchers indicated that over the 20-year period of 1967-87, federal politicians have come increasingly from the highest socioeconomic status circles.

John Porter articulates his stance as:

"If we accept Mannheim's persuasive argument that a person's beliefs about social reality are shaped by the social milieu to which he (or she) has been exposed, we can see that the definitions of reality which provide the framework for making political decisions depend much on the social background and life experiences of politicians. The predominance of some occupational groups and people of one class background means that limited perspectives are brought to bear on public issues."

Integration is a two-way process, a mutual relationship. This does not mean that ethnicity will become homogenized like technology and bureaucracy. Distinctive qualities will become admirable and praiseworthy. All children would be able to see themselves and be seen as real Canadians.

As we relate to the rest of the world, we have within our country the cultural understandings necessary to relate to other countries politically, culturally, economically and socially. We have hardly tapped this aspect of our nation's resources in the social and cultural spheres, much less in the area of economics. In these latter areas, we have failed to use our understanding of people, their ways of life and their languages. Perhaps these deficiencies will be lessened as we increasingly see diversity as a positive resource.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Kevany. There are a number of questions. We will start with Mr Bisson.

Mr Bisson: In your presentation, basically you are saying you recognize that the diversity in the country is something we should be looking at as a strength and building on. I took a note at the beginning, where you were saying, on page 1 of your presentation—it confused me

somewhat. Are you saying you would like to "recommend that we not assert that our Charter of Rights and Freedoms be interpreted in a manner consistent with Canada's multicultural heritage"? Is that a contradiction?

Ms Kevany: I think not. I am saying that if we maintain our charter in light of the previous practices of our multicultural heritage, it would be Anglo dominated, and that is not what we wish to see continued. This multicultural heritage practice historically has not been positive to diverse populations. I do not want it to fit into that vein and then be modified for current situations; I want it to be modified presently, not using historical practices.

Mr Bisson: So you are saying practise what is preached. Okay.

Ms Kevany: Certainly the law sounds good.

The Chair: I am glad that point was clarified, because it did pose some questions in my mind as well.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation. You have spoken so much about the whole question of the multicultural aspect of the country and the diversity that in many ways the strength of the country lies in its diversity. As you know, there is at this point ongoing discussion between the federal government and Quebec dealing with the whole question of redistribution of powers. We do not know what the outcome of that may be, but there are certain scenarios which are placed which result potentially in a separation of Quebec. In the event that there is a separation or a distancing of Quebec from the rest of Canada, do you see this impacting on the multicultural fabric of not only this province but the country?

Ms Kevany: Adversely affecting, definitely. I think there would be some sense that one culture and one language was given more legitimacy than another, and if we are trying to emphasize in Canada that differences are valued but that one is not greater than another, it is inconsistent if we are allowing Quebec other areas of opportunity. I did not address so much the Quebec issue in this presentation, in that our focus is not that. Personally I could speak from another perspective, but as the representative of the Cross Cultural Learner Centre, our stance is that we would support a united Canada; much further than that I cannot really comment.

Mr Ferguson: I would like to thank you very much for your presentation. Obviously, it was well thought out. You outlined not only the strengths but the limitations we presently face. The last comment in your brief stated that we should be seeing diversity as a positive resource. Of course, I look back at my younger days when I was constantly reminded what a wonderful thing it is that we are all different and how boring it would be if everybody was the same and everybody thought individually the way all of us do. Could you just share with the committee what your vision would be in order to encourage that diversity and to help people experience that diversity we have as a country?

1030

Ms Kevany: One of my particular comments in her was that children should be allowed to see themselves as

Canadian. Studies show that kids who are not white do not feel like real Canadians. They are not received. They do not perceive themselves as being Canadian.

I would visualize a Canada that is truly accepting of its diversity and welcoming of diversity, one where every member feels eager and satisfied and delighted to say that he is Canadian. When they are overseas they would pronounce Canadian status first and they would not be asked by others who are living in the same city, where are you from and when are you going home?

There is a visitor status that is given to people who are not of the chartered cultures. My vision would be that people would be given an opportunity through teachers, through all members who are institutionally powerful in our society, to strengthen and give credence to members of their cultures and recognize those people as being equal members of Canadian society.

Mr Sutherland: My question is related to multiculturalism, but factored in against the basic background of French and English. What I would like to know from you is your perspective in terms of how you balance off the two, because there certainly seems to be a perception out there that if you are promoting multiculturalism, then somehow that is taking away from the two founding areas or supposedly founding areas of French and English. I wonder how you feel you can still promote the rights of francophone-speaking people within this province and within the country and allow for recognition of the aspirations of those people, combined with the aspirations of a very growing multicultural society.

Ms Kevany: I do not know what we can recommend in terms of legislation, but what I certainly would recommend in terms of personal acceptance is that people should be encouraged to be bilingual in Canada, to say the least; that is, French and English.

I spent the weekend in Quebec and found that everyone around me was speaking French. I have competence in French, but I find that for others who do not, it is a culture where you need to speak the language in order to appreciate it, as you would for any cultural integration.

I think it is necessary that Canada encourage bilingualism. I think it should be put into the school system. I think it should be required that people study French at all levels. Francophones in Ontario are at a disadvantage because it is not just language they are asking for; they are asking for cultural support. There is a big need, not only for teachers being sent from Quebec to teach in Ontario, because the teachers are very adamant that the parents should also be French-speaking and the parents who send their kids to French schools in Ontario have a difficulty with the teacher relationship.

My sister and a number of my friends have kids in schools where there are not competent French-speakers and they have difficulty conversing with the teacher. So there are basic problems with making it integrated within Ontario. I think it is necessary to spend more time and effort on making it a more integrated system of francophone culture within Ontario. It is not just the language

issue. I think bilingualism is a necessary component of Canada and I think it should be maintained.

Mrs Cunningham: I have changed my question after hearing the last response. First of all, the Cross Cultural Learner Centre has done much, I think, in the way of educating the London community and has a strong history for certainly this area of Southwest Ontario, and I thank you for that, and certainly in the schools.

On your last comment, one of the, I think, challenges in Ontario has been the implementation of our perceived opportunity with regard to Bill 8, for the francophone community to have the services that they need and are necessary. With your experience, there have been some persons before the committee, even one today, who is not particularly happy with that aspect of our legislation, not happy with probably the implementation of it more than anything. But that is a personal point of view. I am just wondering if that has come into your deliberations and your centre, given the statements you have made today with regard to the need for bilingualism.

Ms Kevany: Just as I would say that it is more than a language issue; it is a cultural issue. We support the development of communities whatever language they speak and what we encourage is the maintenance of the first language, as we would encourage the maintenance of French in Ontario, not only funds supporting the language but also supporting culture because, again, it is much more complicated than retaining the language. So within the context of Cross Cultural Learner Centre we would support cultural diversity and maintenance of language skills.

Mrs Cunningham: The question may have been a bit technical because for those of us who have been involved in the implementation of that piece of legislation, there has been criticism within our own city, and certainly where I represent London. I just wondered if you had any positive or negative things to say about that. That may have been a tough question because it is not—

Ms Kevany: It is not my domain really.

Mrs Cunningham: All right. Thank you. Sorry.

SUSAN SMITH

The Chair: Can I call next Susan Smith.

Mme Smith : Bonjour, soyez les bienvenus à London.

J'aimerais faire une réponse personnelle comme mémoire personnel. J'ai tout juste quelques points à spécifier. J'aimerais débiter avec les gens qui sont peut-être un peu les technophobes. Il y a la technologie qui nous aide beaucoup et je vous encourage à vous en servir.

Je vais débiter avec l'économie, les aspirations des travailleurs et travailleuses ici en Ontario. Avec l'élection d'un gouvernement que beaucoup de monde attend pour répondre fondamentalement aux aspirations des travailleuses, il y a plusieurs points qui touchent à toute la discussion de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération. Pour répondre à quelques points : je critique la proposition d'une économie qui globalise. Si je la critique sur l'échelle globale, il s'agit de mon choix ici en Ontario d'avoir un gouvernement qui j'aimerais voir répondre aux besoins fondamentaux au lieu de répondre aux marchés capitaux.

Si je demeure protectionniste pour réaliser les buts, je vois que les valeurs qui sont partagées ici en Ontario et peut-être partout au Canada sont celles-ci : les bénéfices d'un programme national socialisé de santé ; l'application dans le domaine de notions de calcul ; l'alphabétisation ; le bilinguisme sinon trilinguisme, si on n'a pas encore un système d'éducation qui crée des polyglottes. Je me demande pourquoi accepter l'idée d'une économie globale sans représentation directe aux programmes, au gouvernement mondial. Une autre valeur que je pense est partagée au sein des citoyens d'Ontario ces jours-ci, ce sont les droits et la participation des autochtones. Il y a un défi énorme : prévenir les besoins humains qui sont très profonds chez nos homologues autochtones ici en Ontario. Les doléances légitimes des personnes autochtones méritent qu'on se charge de la question de réformes de nos institutions politiques même ici en Ontario. Je suis prête à poser des questions difficiles faisant face aux situations où nos peuples autochtones ne sont pas autorisés. Je prends, par exemple, les 60 000 autochtones à Toronto, une grande population qui ne se trouve pas représentée comme telle, ni au niveau de «représentation by population», ni présentement au niveau de notre système législatif à Queen's Park. J'aimerais que vous vous posiez ces questions.

1040

Le rapport Allaire venant des libéraux au Québec signifie un acte politique de mon point de vue prévisible. Ils ont changé de place avec les conservateurs au Québec. Ils avaient siégé comme conservateurs dans la Chambre des communes et présentement changent de places, changent de vêtements ; ce sont de vrais caméléons peut-être.

Nos buts, nos aspirations économiques devraient être encadrés, devraient se trouver sous une rubrique prioritaire de l'écologie. Nous avons un impératif écologique avec lequel tout programme, toute valeur sociale de ces jours-ci doivent se réévaluer. Ce que je cherche auprès du gouvernement provincial ici en Ontario, au niveau des aspirations des travailleuses, est de présenter des points de vue économiques, disons, sur le plan faillites, par exemple, les faillites fédérales. Les travailleuses ou les travailleurs auxquels les compagnies doivent les paiements, les salaires, j'aimerais qu'on change les lois pour que les gens deviennent les créanciers prioritaires.

Enfin, je suis enchantée de notre système ces jours-ci qui est en train de développer le bilinguisme ici en Ontario. Nous en avons grand besoin, il n'y a pas beaucoup de pays et de cantons ici ou à l'étranger qui considèrent une éducation bien développée si elle est unilingue. Nous voulons les notions de calculs, l'alphabétisme, et bien sûr des compétences en technologie pour qu'on continue, comme on en a eu la capacité aussi, grâce aux ressources naturelles qu'on trouve ici. Merci beaucoup.

M. Winninger : Madelle Smith, vous avez beaucoup parlé des droits des autochtones. On a suggéré qu'on pourrait créer une place dans la législature de l'Ontario pour les autochtones. Qu'est-ce que vous pensez de cette proposition ?

Mme Smith : Je suis bien d'accord avec cette proposition. La population autochtone est éparpillée partout au nord du Canada mais ce qu'on trouve au sud de l'Ontario,

c'est une assez grande population qui mérite une représentation au sein de la structure politique ici en Ontario et je serais bien d'accord.

ERROL MENDES

The Chair: Could I call next Errol Mendes.

Mr Mendes: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. The brief which is going around is the brief I sent in to Tannis Manikel, but I am not sure whether you have all received it as yet, so I am sending it around again.

The title of the brief is called A "Push-Pull" Plan For A Flexible Canadian Federalism. I should mention that this brief has already been received by the governments of Quebec, the federal government and the joint committee of the House and Senate on amending the Constitution of Canada, the amending procedures.

To begin then, to paraphrase Mikhail Gorbachev, fate will deal very cruelly with those who are unprepared for an era of change. Canada will soon have to restructure its Confederation bargain. Events and mass psychology in Quebec will be the catalyst for the restructuring.

The Quebec Liberal Party constitutional committee has already recommended a radical restructuring of the Canadian federal system, which will leave it much more decentralized than the European community. Attached to this recommendation is the threat of a referendum on sovereignty late in 1992, if Quebec does not get substantially what it is demanding. The Bélanger-Campeau commission will, in all likelihood, recommend the same sort of sovereignty for Quebec in March 1991.

These recommendations are, and will in large part be driven by the large consensus in Quebec, at least among the francophone majority, that the time has come for some sort of sovereignty. The mass psychology of the Québécois demands a push away from Canada as a reaction to the sense of rejection and humiliation arising from the Meech Lake accord.

For those in Quebec, and elsewhere, who believe in a Canadian Confederation which includes Quebec, the Herculean task is to devise a restructured constitutional framework to allow the Québécois to push away from Canada at this time, but then to devise institutional structures which will entice the people of Quebec to pull towards Canada in the future.

I want to emphasise the next point. At the same time English-speaking Canada will only become interested in such an enterprise if the institutional reforms are also beneficial to the various regional aspirations in the rest of the country. If a new Confederation is ever to arise from the ruins of the present one, there must be a coincidence of interests between Quebec and the various other regions of the country.

Ontario must take a leadership role in this enterprise because no one else is. The federal government has perhaps vested interests which may blind it to the realities of what is necessary or what is indeed possible. Ontario also has the most to lose in a disruptive disintegration of the country, given that the vast majority of our interprovincial trade is with Quebec and given that we have long-standing ties with that province. I will leave it to, perhaps, you

questions to discuss the possible disruption to the Canadian economy in general from such a disintegration.

With these goals in mind, I have suggested to the various governments mentioned in my introduction the following crisis planning and reforms that I am putting forward here to the government of Ontario.

First, the federal government should begin to enumerate all the federal powers that it considers essential for the country to be regarded as one, although decentralized political unit, with national standards in various areas of jurisdiction. The present section 91 of the Constitution Act should not be regarded as such a list because we exist in a different political reality today. I suggest that the essential powers of the federal government may be those which have been used to give Canada a distinct identity and personality. I will be happy to answer questions on what I mean by that in particular, heads of power, at the end of my presentation.

Second, the provinces and the federal government should attempt to agree that all provinces have what I call "sovereign capacity," not "sovereignty" but "sovereign capacity." This means that any province should have the capacity to repatriate any or all of the essential federal powers described above. This will guarantee equality of treatment between Quebec and the other provinces. This, hopefully, will address the main reason why Meech Lake failed, and that is the feeling that Quebec was getting special status and that the other provinces were not. I will be happy to deal with questions on that point too after the presentation.

050

Third, provinces should be able to repatriate such powers through popular referendum. Depending on the percentage of powers that are repatriated, transfer payments from the federal government should also be cut to the same percentage amount, and a proportionate amount of federal taxing room will be moved over to such repatriating provinces. The western provincial governments have already demanded such an arrangement in the areas of health and post-secondary education. I suspect that the people of these provinces would reject such a move in a popular referendum.

The reason I am suggesting popular referendums for repatriation is because I believe, despite regional alienation, that there is a large consensus among English-speaking Canada to have a strong federal government, and I think the people of English Canada will show that their politicians are not representative of their views, that they would want to maintain a strong federal government, even though Bill Vander Zalm may want to separate with any other province that will want to do so. I would suggest that among his other problems he would find that the people of British Columbia would fundamentally reject any such decentralization move.

Fourth, federal seats in the House of Commons should also be cut according to the percentage of essential powers repatriated by a province. Referendums held to determine repatriation of federal powers should be done on a constituency basis. Those ridings with the highest vote for repatriation would lose their federal members until the

requisite percentage is reached. I suggest in my brief that this is the only way to deal with the troubling problem of asymmetrical federalism, which I suggest will undermine any attempt by the federal government to devolve powers across the board to provinces. I think this is one area where the federal government may realize that it may not begin to speak for all of Canada, especially given that the current governing party in Ottawa depends so much for its power base in Quebec.

Fifth, if a repatriating province opts for complete separation, repayment of that province's share of the federal debt will be amortized over time. This may mean that payment of federal taxes would continue, let's say in Quebec, if it did opt for complete separation. But overall, I suggest that if a limited number of powers were repatriated, the appropriate federal taxing room could be shifted over to the province. I gather that the federal government is proposing such a scheme right now, with Bill C-69 dealing with federal transfer payments in the area of health. I oppose this legislation for reasons which I will be willing to explain after the presentation.

There would be a sizable financial incentive not to opt for complete sovereignty or to demand a huge repatriation of powers which are not necessary for the protection of the vital interest of a particular province. I want to emphasize that I do not think that the people outside Quebec would want repatriation of most the essential federal powers of the federal government. There again, you are letting the people speak over the heads of politicians.

Sixth, the Senate should be abolished and replaced by an economic council of Canada. There should be equal numbers of representatives on the council elected by the legislatures of each province including Quebec. Again, I am willing to discuss why I am not recommending direct elections after the presentation. The Yukon and the Northwest Territories should also have representatives. There should also be representatives of the first nations of Canada in this council. The council should have a suspensive veto over all legislation. If three quarters of the members of any of the six regions of Canada vote against any legislation, a Commons-council conference must take place, as is the procedure in the US Congress. If the disagreement is not resolved, the legislation would be vetoed. Representatives of a province in the council should be permitted to only vote on legislation the subject matter of which has not been repatriated.

I suggest the six regions for the purposes of the permanent veto should be as follows: (1) Pacific Canada, namely, British Columbia; (2) the western Prairies—Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba; (3) Ontario; (4) Quebec; (5) Atlantic Canada—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island; (6) the Yukon and Northwest Territories, comprising northern Canada.

Any legislation which involves the vital interests of the first nations of Canada should have the consent of at least three quarters of the first nations' representatives. The council would vote to designate any legislation as being of vital interest to the first nations. The reason I am suggesting that Ontario may live with this arrangement, even though its representation in a reformed upper House would

be considerably cut down, is because it would have the veto power anyway, and, second, it is in the interests of this province to show leadership, as I have said, to recognize that western Canada has legitimate claims, in particular in its desire to have a triple E Senate. Again, Ontario would be showing leadership if it proposed such a version of a triple E Senate which nevertheless safeguarded Ontario's interest in the upper House.

The seventh point I am making is that the council should have responsibility to recommend to the Commons measures to dismantle trade, investment, and services barriers within the economic union of Canada. The representatives of the six regions of Canada should also have responsibility for proposing regional industrial policies and economic development. Similarly, the council should be able to propose national industrial policies to promote Canadian global competitiveness. A secretariat called the Canadian economic commission should be attached to the council.

The reason I am suggesting this point is because much of constitutional debate and reform means very little to the average person on the street. What they are concerned about is losing their jobs. They are concerned about whether the free trade agreement will mean factories closing down and going to Mexico. I suggest that any constitutional reform agenda should include how to factor their economic fears into building up a new Canada which is capable of being globally competitive. I am factoring in, perhaps, the number one concern of Ontarians, and Canadians in general, that is, the economic competitiveness of their companies and their employers.

Finally, any province should be able to reverse a decision to repatriate powers by popular referendum and become fully integrated back into Canadian Confederation, with full restoration of Commons representation and federal transfer payments. I suggest this because if Quebec does decide to take back substantively most of the powers from the federal government, demographics change, and you may have a demographically completely different Quebec in 50 years time. Again, I am willing to answer questions on that after the presentation.

This, in essence, is a blueprint for implementing what I call a push-pull restructuring of Canadian federation, which gives Quebec the sense of and the potential for sovereignty while giving it every incentive to remain in Canada voluntarily and become involved in the superstructures of a new Canadian Confederation. At the same time, the above restructuring will draw all the regions and the first nations into a framework for economic and political co-operation, based on mutual interest and benefit. It is only if we turn the shields of self-interest into enduring bonds of mutual interest that we will have a nation which lasts for a thousand years. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you for giving us an insight into an area that I do not think we had spent a great deal of time on, in the kind of detail you had. Other people have pointed to this kind of direction as a possibility, but you have certainly taken the time to flesh things out a little more. There are a number of questions, and we will try to get through as many as we can.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you, Professor Mendes. You have given us much food for thought. I would let you have one of my ideas as food for thought. I have difficulty with presenters that talk about English Canada.

Mr Mendes: I said English-speaking Canada.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Well, English-speaking Canada even, because I would presume that includes the province of New Brunswick, which is our only officially bilingual province.

Mr Mendes: Point taken. I accept that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think we have to be very careful when we use those terminologies.

I have been very interested from day one of these hearings about the economic spinoffs, effects, considerations that surround this whole issue. You seem to have done a lot of thinking about that. Could you tell us a bit about ways in which we can direct our recommendations to that kind of thought, and things that would be helpful in economic development, as you see it, surrounding the crisis we are in politically?

Mr Mendes: Let me suggest a conceptual framework before I get to the details. Many people say we now live in a global business environment. Yes, we do, but we also live in global villages, and in some respects we do not have just a global village, we have a globe of villages. The villages, so to speak, which will be globally competitive are the ones which trade on their comparative advantage locally. I suggest, for example, that the Maritimes have to get together to figure out what their local comparative advantage will be. They will have to factor virtually everything into that analysis, such as pensions, for example Quebec showed the way. Their pension restructuring system led to a way of financing small- and medium-sized businesses, which have created employment for people.

1100

There is a good example where the Quebec government took back powers with the agreement of the federal government, in the area of pensions, and expanded it not just to the subject matter of pensions but created a pool of capital which then could finance small- and medium-sized local business which would create globally competitive businesses in Quebec. It is about time Ontario started thinking on the same lines. We have the potential to create as big a pension pool in this province, perhaps even bigger and trade on a comparative advantage on that basis; create employment by creating new small- and medium-sized businesses. Likewise, the west may want to do the same thing, trading on its comparative advantages. It is about time we looked at the whole problem holistically, so to speak.

Ms Churley: I am particularly interested in what you had to say about the Senate. A number of people have brought up the triple E Senate as a possible reform. Could you just speak for a moment on why you advocate abolishing the Senate?

Mr Mendes: I believe in abolishing this Senate, and think most people in this country would agree with that. I am suggesting an upper house which has as its primary

concern—and I think it is the primary concern of Canadians—the economic situation in this country. Bob Rae has said it is his primary concern too. With that in mind, you would then have co-operation. As I said, you should turn the shields of self-interest into the bonds of mutual interest. If provinces could get together on that basis and understand they are in this fight together—there are jobs being lost every day in this province and in this country, and if they could get together on that basis the shields of self-interest would fall.

I am suggesting that we in Ontario could live with a triple E Senate in an amended version if we had that as the basis of an upper house. We would still have our veto, as I am suggesting, but we would have as the basis mutual interest.

Mrs Cunningham: It is good to see you. One of the advantages is that we will be able to chat again, and that is a good thing because there are so many interesting questions in your brief. You caught my interest when you said Ontario must take the leadership role. I have said it before, that we have done it in the past and we have the most to lose. I agree with you, but I do not think most Ontarians would. Having travelled this province in the last year, I was very discouraged at the attitudes I saw. I also think we saw some of the reasons for them that we could deal with at the provincial level. But I would like you to expand upon just how we can take that leadership role.

The Chair: Mr Mendes, if I could interject and perhaps ask you as you are answering that you also comment further on how it is that we would have the most to lose.

Mrs Cunningham: That would have been my next question, so that is fine.

Mr Mendes: First, we have the most interprovincial business with Quebec; I think the latest figures are something like \$30 billion. That is a sizable amount for any country, let alone province. I am not suggesting that that would go immediately upon separation, but there would be considerable disruption to that interprovincial flow.

Second, this province is a manufacturing province, and it is a borrowing and lending province. It relies to a large extent on the perceived stability of this economy to international investors. I am not sure whether you are aware of something, but the Japanese started pulling out investment money from Canada during the Oka crisis. Consider what will happen if the crisis of Quebec separating occurred. Consider what the Japanese would do then to the vital financial and investment sectors of Ontario. That is something people should keep in mind when they say "Let them go."

The Chair: Very, very briefly, Mrs Cunningham.

Mrs Cunningham: Well, the same question, Mr Chairman, yours and mine. How do we show this kind of leadership? What are the kinds of things we are going to have to do? We are obviously trying to do something here, but you must know that here in London the representation we had hoped to get before the committee from many of the groups that I personally asked to come—there were other things for them to do, and these are traditionally

groups that would be well represented at a forum such as this.

Mr Mendes: In terms of the leadership question, which I think is what you are asking me, it is a spinoff from what happened at Meech Lake and it is a spinoff from the total disenchantment with politicians, in particular the federal bunch of politicians we have, and in particular one person I need not mention.

I think Ontario should start exercising a new moral leadership by saying: "We can step into the breach. We can exercise that moral leadership. We can recognize the interests of the west, the interests of the first nations, the interests of Quebec, the interests of Atlantic Canada and we'll put it all together in the package and this is what it looks like." We are recognizing that our interest may be to have a form of the status quo, but in light of our moral leadership we are saying: "No, the status quo is not acceptable. We are proposing something different and this is what the package may look like."

It may look like something I am presenting, but I am suggesting that you could present that to the rest of the country in the form of leadership. I suggest to you that the federal government is totally incapable of doing that because of its vested interest and because, unfortunately, of the total lack of credibility the leader of the federal government has in the country at the moment.

The Chair: Thank you, Professor Mendes. We extended the time for questions because of the vast interest shown by the members, but we will have to move on at this point. Thank you very much.

Mr Mendes: Thank you.

LONDON CULTURAL INTERPRETATION SERVICE

The Chair: Could I invite next Nathan Garber from the London Cultural Interpretation Service?

Mr Garber: Thank you very much. I should preface my remarks by saying that I am yet another one who will be speaking to you on the issues related to immigrants and the adaptation of immigrants to Canada and to where that fits into public policy. Why you are hearing so much of that from London is because, as you may or may not know, London is the third-largest recipient of refugees in Ontario, and we have in London a very well-established and quite sophisticated network of services for the settlement and integration of refugees and immigrants. Consequently we have looked at these issues quite a lot, and that is why you are hearing from at least three different groups today from this city.

As a nation, we have come to think that our belief in the value of our ethnic and cultural diversity is one of the features that differentiates us from other countries. We have developed the concept of multiculturalism to conceptualize this belief and we have created programs and services with the aim of enabling our immigrant communities and their children to attain full participation in Canadian society without giving up those aspects of their heritage which are important to their own cultural identity. In my presentation I want to discuss the notion of multiculturalism as a public policy; how it has changed since it was originally

conceived and how it might be recognized in the future in Canada and in Ontario.

When the notion of multiculturalism was introduced in the 1960s, immigrants had been arriving mostly from Europe. Their settlement here was facilitated by well-established ethnocultural groups and by a commonality among European cultures. Federal and provincial programs that were invented and classed as multicultural were largely designed to enable these immigrants to preserve certain aspects of their European heritage, and these programs took the form of federal funding for heritage language training, festivals and folk arts groups.

With the arrival of the first wave of Vietnamese boat people in 1978, the situation began to change, and changed very quickly. Since 1978, most of our immigrants have come from southeast Asia, from the Caribbean, from central America, the Middle East and more recently from Africa. Many are refugees and they come from countries where the climate, the economy, the political and social conditions are radically different from those of Canada. These people have enormous barriers to overcome before they can become integrated into the broader community. Adaptation and language acquisition may be a long and difficult process for them. In addition, refugees are less concerned with heritage preservation than with settlement and survival.

Since this notion of multiculturalism first began to be implemented in government programs, we have had not only this major shift in the ethnocultural makeup of our communities—especially in Ontario—and a very different set of needs of our immigrant population, we have also acquired a new Constitution, a Charter of Rights and Freedoms, we have moved towards the implementation of employment equity and towards the elimination of discrimination against the physically disabled. All of these issues and the public debate over them has profoundly affected our understanding of the meaning of multiculturalism.

1110

For those of us who work with immigrants, multiculturalism in the context of public policy has come to represent the idea that all public services should recognize and respond to the multicultural nature of the communities they serve. This new notion of multiculturalism embraces the idea that in public policy it no longer makes sense to think of mainstream as something different from multicultural, but rather that the mainstream is multicultural.

Most important, multiculturalism has come to mean that in areas of public policy, everyone should have the same right of access to government programs and services, that everyone should have the same opportunity and the same access as are enjoyed by those of us who speak the dominant official language of the community.

Given the resistance across the country and the resistance we have heard here to providing services in both official languages, it is not surprising that this notion of multiculturalism might be rejected out of hand by some people. So I want to just take a moment to address their concerns.

If this new notion of multiculturalism is adopted in Canada and in Ontario, it does not mean that every public service must become multilingual. Nor am I suggesting

that immigrants did not need to learn English or French. In fact, most immigrants and refugees are incredibly resourceful people. They adjust very quickly in Canada. They learn the language they need to participate in the community and they can begin very quickly to contribute to the economic and social development of Canada.

But when a crisis such as unemployment, illness or family violence occurs, it is then that they are prevented by language and cultural barriers from obtaining the help that is available to others in the community. In the future Canada programs, policies and services must be formulated to eliminate these barriers, just as we are trying to eliminate the barriers to full participation of deaf persons, women and other disadvantaged groups.

Second, I want to suggest that a new meaning for multiculturalism does not have to result in a major increase in public expenditures. The London Cultural Interpretation Service, my own agency, is an example of a service which provides access to existing services for non-English speakers. We provide interpreters, trained to bridge both cultural and language barriers, to government offices, social agencies, institutions and professionals throughout the area. This allows them to serve clients and patients in many languages without having to hire and train bilingual employees. Our agency is non-profit and supported by a combination of funding and fees for service.

One of the main reasons that we have been successful is the recognition that overcoming language and cultural barriers enables public and private organizations to provide their services in a more sensitive, a more cost-effective, more timely and efficient manner. It frequently results in cost saving to the service provider, and by enabling early intervention, it can reduce the cost to the public.

To conclude, multiculturalism is a notion that has served us well in Canada and in Ontario. It has been instrumental in creating the cultural diversity that we enjoy when we attend multicultural festivals and when we participate in programs which strengthen our own cultural identities. But it is time for the notion of multiculturalism to be reformulated in light of the changes to our province and our country and to the changes in our attitudes since the 1960s.

We must recognize that culture and language present formidable obstacles to full participation in our economic social and political institutions, not only in Toronto where it is obvious, but in most communities in Ontario and indeed throughout the rest of the country.

Our commitment to multiculturalism as a public policy must now go beyond programs to preserve cultural heritage and begin to treat multiculturalism as an issue of equality of access. Here in Ontario, I would like to see the day when every ministry and every federal department ensures as a matter of policy that the barriers to access to service are removed for all citizens. That is not the case now, and I would like it to happen in the future.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Garber, for putting so clearly before us the concept that the mainstream is or should be multicultural. I think that is a useful addition to our hearings. There is time for some questions. I will start with Mr Malkowski.

Mr Malkowski: I have been very impressed by your presentation on multiculturalism. I have great respect for that. You mentioned values, that equality and accessibility were very important to individuals from different cultural backgrounds. It is very important that we increase the pool of interpreters so that people from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds can access services in the public. The United Nations has a communications system whereby all different languages are provided for all members through headsets and interpretation, and that is a great vision. I would like to know if you agree with that vision for Canada.

Mr Garber: Well, I am not sure. The notion of interpretation that we deal with is something we call cultural interpretation, and it is used in face-to-face interpretation between two parties. The purpose is not only to provide language interpretation but to bridge cultural barriers. That's something that cannot be done in simultaneous translation. It involves helping both parties to understand what the expectations are of the other party.

For example, people who come from a country where they have never seen a doctor in their life have no idea what to expect when they visit a doctor. Even if they have seen a doctor, the way health care is provided in other countries is so very different than it is here that often some cultural bridging is needed in order that a proper interview can take place. I see that as very important in light of the recent immigration that we have had to this country.

Mr Malkowski: I would like to briefly add something to that, please. I understand that you said that a cultural training program probably needs to be set up in Ontario in the universities to provide the appropriate training for interpreters who are going to be involved in those situations.

Mr Garber: I believe that such programs do need to be established. Whether they should be university or college based, I do not know.

Mr Beer: I found a great deal of what you had to say placing the context of our discussion around multiculturalism, because I suppose after the English-French discussion, people get very concerned at times about what we mean by multiculturalism. In a sense, if we could find another word, it would probably help us, because we always seem to end up in those discussions. I think your emphasis on that cultural interpretation is a very appropriate one, especially in terms of where the immigrants in particular now are coming and in many cases may speak English or French, but there are other kinds of barriers to full access.

Mr Garber: Exactly.

1120

Mr Beer: What I wanted to ask you then was, the federal government has recently proclaimed that the bill could create a federal department of multiculturalism. Do we need to approach this issue in Ontario as well in a structural sense, or do you think that could be self-defeating and rather we should be trying to have a policy that goes over all of the various departments and is enacted in that way?

Even within many involved in the ethnocultural communities, I know there is quite a debate as to whether in

fact you want something structural; whether that helps or just creates more problems. What is your sense? How would that federal department, for example, or a provincial one, help you in the kind of work that you and your colleagues are doing?

Mr Garber: Well, this has been a difficult question to deal with. Right now, at the Ontario level, most of the work in this area is being done through the Ministry of Citizenship. But many other ministries do have some recognition of the need to change their policies to adapt to the multicultural communities that now exist. To tell you the truth, I do not really have a good answer. I think it does need some centre of focus to take the leadership in this, but a policy of multiculturalism must be something that is spread across the government and that all ministries take in to consideration when developing programs and policies.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Garber. We will end there.

TODD BUTTENHAM

The Chair: Next is Todd Buttenham.

Mr Buttenham: I would like to thank the committee for letting me make a presentation this morning. I had intended to begin my presentation to you today by saying something clichéd about Canada once more being faced with a crisis of enormous proportions, one that is again pulling the country apart. While this is no doubt true, it implies we will again be mired in a deluge of backroom negotiations, finger pointing, constitutional wrangling and regional provincial self-interest.

It has become painfully obvious that what is lacking among our provincial and federal politicians is a renewed vision of Canada. There seems to be no lack of opinion among premiers wanting greater powers for their provinces or federal leaders fighting to maintain jurisdiction over their piece of the pie. I and many other Canadians have become cynical about the current process. How can we not feel that way when the Prime Minister of Canada attempted to reach an agreement on the Meech Lake accord by simply rolling the dice?

It is the same man who is taking us through the next step in the process. I strongly doubt his government's abilities to develop a creative solution which begs the questions: Who will represent the aspirations of Canada for all Canadians? Who has the vision to face the inevitable changes that must be made for Canada to continue to establish itself on the world stage? Who will supply the glue that binds this country, not in spite of its differences but because of them?

In large part, we must rely on ourselves for these answers and also on our elected politicians, which is why I am here today. I am here to strongly urge this panel that, while I believe it is important for the federal government to maintain many of its powers, it is time to discuss fundamental changes in its sharing of powers with the provinces. We have asked what Quebec want for decades. They now have made it abundantly clear. The Allaire report may or may not simply be a negotiating position, but regardless of this, it is time for all Canadians to decide in what kind of nation they wish to be.

It may be that the Quebec Liberal Party's Allaire report has forced upon us something that was inevitable. I say this not because I believe that Quebec should be given the sweeping powers that the report discusses. No province should be allowed to become, in essence, a province state. However, the federal government's ability to assess the needs of each region is being diminished because, one, provincial jurisdictions are becoming more complex and diverse in areas such as culture and socially and economically and, two, the federal government, because of a recession with deficit reduction, has less latitude for distributing wealth.

In relative terms, Canada is a young country. The institutions and methods inherent in building this country have in good part remained unchanged. The means by which we established Confederation were useful at a time when we were a much looser affiliation of regions, each groping to establish its economic viability, while seeing that Confederation was useful in further advancing its economic needs. However, many of these conditions no longer hold true, and in fact it has become more vital on an economic basis for Canada to strengthen its position.

With the development of the European Community, the Pacific Rim countries, and the overall move toward globalization of trade, it will be imperative that Canada speaks and is seen as a strong trading partner. As well, and more important, Canadians' sense of what makes their country one, what binds it together, must be re-explored, if for no other reason than the fact that our sense of who we are comes from our ability as a nation to live together.

Perhaps, like a parent afraid to let his child leave the nest, the way we view ourselves now has blinded our perception. The strain between Ottawa and the provinces, French and English, central Canada versus the Maritimes and the Prairies, has created a sense of us and them. We must re-examine this diversity and hopefully make some of the differences more equitable by a form of power redistribution. That brings me to the role Ontario must play in the future of Confederation. For profound changes to come about for this country, this province must be concerned with more than maintaining the status quo, aware of more than its own self-interest.

Ontario premiers have in many ways played pivotal roles in constitutional negotiations. Premier Rae must continue this tradition, but he must also broaden it. As leader of the most populous and economically diverse and powerful province, Bob Rae must in large part carry the message into federal-provincial negotiations that Ontario will put the good of the country ahead of the good of the province. If altering the power sharing between Ottawa and the provinces is to work, it must work in a way that is beneficial for all Canadians. Although other provinces may maintain that they would put the interest of the entire country ahead of provincial self-interest, Ontario has the political and economic clout to influence the direction of future negotiations.

As I mentioned earlier, Canada's future as a nation may lie in a form of power sharing with the provinces. All provinces would participate, because to give Quebec alone a greater share of powers would be politically impossible. It will hopefully be enough to appease Quebec with a

greater share of powers along with all of the other provinces. However, whether Quebec remains within Confederation or not, these changes could be viable.

Many of the changes and redistribution could be carried out without constitutional talks. This would avoid much of the wrangling involved regarding the complex issues and negotiating constitutional change, and also the amending formula. Too much ill will or talks that were bogged down would not be productive in such an urgent time.

Perhaps the answer lies in allowing for agreements outside the constitutional format. Bilateral or multilateral arrangements and ad hoc accords between federal and provincial governments could work for two reasons: one, it would allow individual provinces to share power, leave jurisdiction to the federal government or, in some cases, negotiate for complete power over certain ministries; two, as a means of giving Quebec the ability to consolidate its special status. Because it would be difficult to obtain special status for Quebec within the Constitution, the solution may be to allow the province to obtain more power that is also being offered to other provinces.

This plan would allow each province to decide whether it would like to obtain certain powers or avoid weakening ties with the federal government because it was unable or unwilling to take responsibilities for certain ministries. The federal government, however, must remain vital. Quebec cannot be given jurisdiction over the number of ministries it wishes to obtain, if for no other reason than to maintain Ottawa's ability to set national standards.

1130

The federal government must maintain power over areas I have listed here in my presentation. I will list some of them briefly. They include: external affairs, international trade, defence, the environment, research and development, customs and tariffs, equalization payments, justice and public security. Some of the areas that I feel could be shared or taken over by the provinces if national standards can be maintained include: unemployment insurance, natural resources, education, culture, fisheries, labour and family policy, urban and social affairs, and possibly immigration and native affairs as well. Much of what I have listed is contingent upon the ability to maintain national standards for these areas. If that cannot be guaranteed and in some way policed, then they should stay in federal hands.

With an increase in provincial responsibilities, an acceptable amount of money will have to be put into place. This could possibly be done with an increase in transfer payments to those provinces participating, or a shift in taxation responsibilities.

I must, at this point, make specific reference to native affairs. Despite what happened at Oka this past summer and in other places across the country, I am willing to see the provincial and federal governments share this responsibility. However, I think it is important that Canada's aboriginal peoples have the opportunity to develop some form of self-government. They may do so either by gaining municipal autonomy or by taking much broader powers equivalent to a type of provincial status.

If I may make one further reference to the Allaire report, it is that I agree with the submission that all barriers to free mobility of goods, people and capital should be dropped across Canada. While I find this statement contradictory of Quebec's sovereignist aspirations, it makes sense in terms of Canada's economic competitiveness.

While my presentation has only allowed me time to present what I feel are guidelines, I felt strongly that I should be here today. What Canada as a nation is facing is a challenge to its very existence. We have been challenged in this way in the past and we have grown. I must stress the importance of not giving in to the small-mindedness of a few people, or the tunnel vision of some provincial politicians more concerned with their own jurisdiction. Some of the suggestions I have made today may possibly be worthwhile, but we must all be a part of this process. Fair, open negotiations must take place this time. We all have a right to speak for, and must all take responsibility for, the country's future.

We must do our utmost to keep Quebec within Confederation, but we must appeal to it and all Canadians on a level not dominated by balance sheets and economic forecasts. In a country this vast, we are linked more in our hearts and minds. Take away one of these links and Canadians' sense of who they are will be diminished, the whole being only as great as the sum of its parts.

It is these ideas I ask you to consider clearly and thoughtfully. We are giving you responsibility to establish the Canada of the future after the commission closes. Please handle the next step of the process with care. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Bутtenham. I think we are quite conscious of your last point, that the process from here on in needs to be dealt with very carefully, and we will do our best to keep your hearing in mind. We will have time probably for one question.

Mrs Cunningham: Todd, it is refreshing and great to see you here this morning. Can I ask you a personal question? Are you a student?

Mr Bутtenham: Not any more.

Mrs Cunningham: The reason I ask the question is that the last time we did go through this process, young people were very much involved; in fact, there were task forces all over Ontario and Quebec at that point in time, with the council for Canadian unity. Actually, it was across Canada, but I was involved in those too, and young people were very involved. It was basically a three-year public education process we went through.

I have not, certainly in my political career, seen anybody willing to think of a long-term process for long-term gains, and I wondered if you would talk to us a little about what you see. I know your problem with the "who," because we all have a problem in today's society, crossing party lines. Who the "who" will be, none of us knows. I understand that. Given your statement about the economy not being as important perhaps, given other statements today that the economy is very important, how do we educate ourselves to realize the importance of the future of this country and how it can best be achieved?

Mr Bутtenham: I tried to make it clear in my report that the process in a sense be non-partisan, because what we are talking about here is the future of the country. What is happening here is that push has come to shove and we are being made to make some decisions right now. I think one of the most important steps has been taken right here. You have opened up the political process to the people. You have given everyone an opportunity or a number of people an opportunity to come and speak their mind.

I think that is important in some form, and that is one of the reasons I talked about the possibilities of a sharing of powers between the provinces and the federal government. That process, I believe, does not necessarily have to mean that provinces have jurisdiction over a certain area but that they are allowed to comment on the way certain ministries are going to be carried out.

I think that on some level it is important to continue to have that kind of process work with the public as well. I am not sure exactly how it will work, but there should continue to be some type of public forum, perhaps, a road show, if you will, of this sort, possibly on a three- to four-year basis, where people have the opportunity to come and speak in a forum or possibly a town hall type of function. That could be carried out in individual constituencies so that individual MPs or MPPs or even civic politicians can ask, "What is wrong with the process or how do you think we could improve it?"

Mrs Cunningham: I thank you for that. The long term is of interest to myself. Although we have been given some deadlines, I think they can be negotiated. I do not mean we have, but Quebec has given us some. I think that is the kind of thing that has to be discussed. It is a very short time frame to do what I think needs to be done.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

ANDREAS PAPADOPOULOS

The Chair: Has Andreas Papadopoulos arrived? We are actually moving a little ahead of schedule in an attempt to accommodate additional speakers. Go ahead.

Mr Papadopoulos: I would like to thank all the members for allowing me the opportunity to speak today.

I would like to begin my comments by saying that I make no apology for the fact that I am proud of this country, and I am proud to be one of its citizens. I make no apology for the fact that I support a bilingual nation from coast to coast, or a Constitution that guarantees each and every citizen equality under the law. Nor do I apologize for the fact that I am a supporter of a strong federal government that is able to speak on behalf of all Canadians regardless of the language they speak or the area in which they live.

Unfortunately, these fundamentals of Canadian federalism seem to be out of vogue right now. I am not quite sure why this is, but if these fundamentals are to be disregarded in any future constitutional negotiations, I fear for the continued survival of Canada as we know it. Sure, we may get some federation that is still called Canada, but the name would be the only similarity.

Essentially, my aim here today is to urge members of this committee to take into consideration the fragile bonds that have held Canada together for the past 123 years.

These bonds have been heavily strained over the last few years, and because of these new strains Canada is on the brink of falling apart. And make no mistake about it, a Canada without Quebec would not be Canada.

1140

Having said that, I feel there should be certain minimum conditions that we as Canadians should adhere to when entering any future constitutional negotiations. At this point I would like to talk about the Quebec question and how the rest of Canada should respond to the latest demands from that province. Although it is important that Quebec become a member of the constitutional family, I do not think we should be selling our soul in order to get an agreement. If we are to take the Allaire report as the minimum demands of any future Quebec negotiating position, then I do genuinely fear for the future of this country. However, rather than succumb to these new political forces that favour the decentralization of Canada, I believe the time has come to fight back and fight hard.

For the longest time, many political leaders in Canada have been accepting as gospel the idea that Canada must undergo a period of decentralization if it is to survive in the next century. In my mind, the contrary is true. If Canada is to survive economically in the next century, the federal government will need the responsibilities it already has in order to foster a national vision that can make Canada competitive in the world.

The most frustrating thing about the proposals coming out of Quebec is that they do not resolve the central problem in Canada today, that is: Does Quebec wish to remain part of Canada? Until this question is resolved one way or the other, it would seem pointless to sit down and negotiate a constitutional arrangement with Quebec while the threat of separation is being used as a bargaining chip. That is one added pressure that is not required. I believe there exists in Quebec a majority of people who wish to remain part of Canada. It is time that the rest of Canada began fighting those forces in Quebec that are promising the moon to the people of Quebec should they opt for independence.

As I stated earlier, we in the rest of Canada, and especially in Ontario, must resist the temptation of appeasing the decentralist forces both inside and outside Quebec. We must discourage the "keep Canada together at any cost" mentality that is developing across this nation. I further believe that there will always exist a minority of people inside Quebec who favour outright independence for that province. I do not believe we should be bending over backwards trying to accommodate that group of people who just wish Canada would go away. Canada has been bullied for far too long by these independentist forces in Quebec. At every turn, Canada has been kicked in the pants by these people, and we just sit here and take it. The time has arrived for us to take the initiative and start playing hardball with these people who wish to dismantle Canada. We in the rest of Canada and even some people in Quebec have become so frightened of stepping on the toes of the separatists in Quebec that when worthless documents like the Allaire report are released, some of our spineless leaders applaud it as a basis for negotiation. This is utter nonsense. This report puts a gun to our head and

we say, "Thank you." If this country is to survive, this type of pandering has to stop. Let it be made clear that the onus is on those wishing to rip Canada apart to prove why.

I have always found it ironic that the separatists claim that Canada is a dead weight that is not allowing Quebec to realize its full potential. If that is the case, why do they wish to maintain an economic union, with a common currency? I see, this is all being done for our benefit, out of the goodness of their heart? This is just plain rubbish. We in the rest of Canada, along with Quebecers, should be wary of the half truths and double standards being advocated by the separatist forces. Let's acknowledge them for what they really are. They are pedlars of an inferior product, no more and no less.

It is easy to say that Canada needs change. It is, however, difficult to stand up and speak on behalf of a strong, united Canada. Essentially, the separation of Quebec from Canada would be the easy way out of solving our problems. There is no need to throw the baby out with the bath water, as the old saying goes. Let us all keep in mind that for 123 years, on the northern half of this continent, we have been working together to build a strong, vibrant nation respected the world over. What will we have contributed to the human spirit if we let Canada die? This is a question that we should all be asking ourselves in the days and months ahead. In the final analysis, we could allow Canada to be a footnote in history or an enduring example of the human spirit. The choice is up to us. Let us not squander the opportunity. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Papadopoulos. There are a couple of questions.

Mr Bisson: I hear what you are saying, and I think I hear what the committee says. There is no question that no one should succumb to anybody else's wishes or needs. I think everybody hears that. The problem I have, though, is that there is a lot of strong rhetoric used on both sides of the issue. I hate to use analogies, because too many people sometimes use analogies and tend to distort what the facts are. The reality is that within and outside of Quebec there are problems with the federalist system we have presently that need to be addressed, and if we as individuals within this country use a lot of strong rhetoric such as you utilize in this, what does that do to the building of goodwill with respect to being able to negotiate a half-decent settlement? I wish that would happen, but do you not think there is maybe more to be gained by trying to sit down and talk about the real issues in a sensible manner in which we are not getting our dander up at every opportunity.

Mr Papadopoulos: I agree totally with you. I think we should sit down and rationally discuss the issues that confront this nation today. But I do not think it is being flexible on the part of Quebec, to take an example, to propose deadlines for separation if we do not agree with its demands. That is not rational discussion.

I understand what you are saying by rational discussion. We have to sit down and look at the issues. That is fine, but I also believe there are certain fundamentals we have to adhere to. I do not think the Allaire report was a serious form of negotiation. It is an ultimatum, and ultimatums do

not contribute; they detract from this national discussion we are having. You cannot give an ultimatum and expect the person to whom you are giving it to sit back and say, "Sure, I'll take that ultimatum." I do not think that will work at all.

The Chair: Unfortunately, there is not enough time to deal with it, but I would like to pursue that further.

Mr Offer: In your presentation a number of things have been stated. I make two observations on your presentation. The first is that the Allaire report is not the basis for negotiation, and the second is that you are, and you have been very clear, a supporter of a strong federal government.

On whether we in Ontario or the federal government, the rest of Canada, should be accommodating towards any of the aspirations espoused by Quebec, is it your position that Allaire is not only a non-starter but indeed any accommodation towards some of the aspirations of Quebec is a non-starter?

Mr Papadopoulos: Yes, I think we should accommodate. There are legitimate concerns on the part of Quebecers and natives and other groups in Canada and I understand that. However, I cannot see that document as a place we can start to negotiate with, because it has imposed so many conditions it ceases to be flexible. Is that a document that is negotiable or are those the minimum demands? We are constantly confronted with minimum demands. I do not understand that. How can we be accommodating when they do not want to be accommodated? They want to be appeased, and there is a difference there. If I ask you for something and say, "If I don't get it, that's it," that is not being flexible.

Yes, we need a dialogue, we have to be flexible, but that document is not flexible. Even the leader of the Parti québécois said Canada would be committing hara-kiri if it were to accept that document, and that is coming from a separatist. Furthermore, I find it ironic that recently the leaders of Quebec have been asking for those responsibilities that would enable it to be a nation, so to speak. Let's ask ourselves this question: Why should the federal government give away those powers which would allow it to function as a national government? Why does Canada not need those powers to survive in the 21st century? I just do not understand it. There are so many double standards coming from Quebec that I just cannot sit down and say that those positions are proper positions to take.

The Chair: One last quick question.

1150

Mr Sutherland: You mentioned in your presentation about being opposed to decentralization and you made special reference to Quebec and its demands, but there seems to be a growing sense outside of Quebec in other regions of this country that maybe a centralized form of government is not the way to go. What would you say to the unemployed fisherman in Newfoundland or the logger in British Columbia about that sense that we have to have a strong centralized government in order for the country to work as a whole? You stated in the opening that you are proud to be a Canadian and of the things that Canada stands for. Is your position against decentralization over-

riding that fact? If the evidence came in and said maybe a more decentralized form of government is better, would you accept that?

Mr Papadopoulos: Well, if I were to see this proof, then maybe I would change my mind. I have yet to see the proof. I do not see how Canada could survive as a nation, and what I mean as a nation is one entity, if we keep on giving new powers, new responsibilities to the provinces. The argument being put forth nowadays economically is that the federal government is so saddled with debt that there is no way that they can give the services that Canadians require and that therefore the provinces should take over the responsibilities.

Well, hold on one second. You name me one province in this country that is not saddled with debt either. How could the provinces take care of these responsibilities? I mean, this is stuff that is thrown out in desperation, and we are supposed to accept these as answers, "Oh my God, yes, that is right, the provinces should take it over." That is nonsense. If you sit down and think about it, you will come to the same conclusion.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Papadopoulos.

Mr Papadopoulos: Thank you.

CONNOR McDONOUGH

The Chair: I invite next Connor McDonough.

Mr McDonough: Good morning, Mr Chairman, fellow committee members. I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you and your committee. My co-author is regrettably unavailable to be here today and sends his apologies.

Over the past year, Canadians have begun to examine and question the institutions, values and ties that bind us all together. In the wake of the failure of the Meech Lake accord, no one person is articulating a truly national vision. Provincial politicians are putting forward their own agendas and Ottawa has shown absolutely no leadership. Canadians are looking for someone to take a lead in formulating a national outlook and vision that corresponds to the realities of the 1990s.

We hope that this committee will be able to provide that leadership. It was approximately three years ago today that I appeared before the Ontario select committee on constitutional reform. During this process I was one of the few students to appear before the committee. I am glad to see that this is changing and more people of my relative age group are participating in this debate that will affect the future of this country. Irrevocably, the conclusions that are reached from the meetings of these committees and what you decide and what the people of Canada decide over the next two years will determine the future of Canada.

When I first appeared before this committee three years ago, I was opposed to the Meech Lake accord. I believed it was a poorly written document and I believed it had not properly addressed the needs of all Canadians. In the time since then, I have realized that that document was not designed to address the needs, first of all, of all Canadians. I came to realize that that document was in fact a product of the Quebec round, a document designed to

bring Quebec into the constitutional family, to bring Quebec into the Canadian fold once again in so far as it would become a full partner in Confederation.

It was with great sorrow that I saw the demise of the Meech Lake accord. There were many people, including many respected members of the academia in Toronto and elsewhere in Canada, who said that we would wake up on 24 June and there would be no problem, and indeed when 24 June did arrive, they said, "We are still here, the world is still here, Canada is still here." I feel that they are very naive, that they were not being responsible to themselves or to Canadians, because I do not believe that anyone expected Canada to be facing the crisis that it will face immediately after the demise of Meech. As we all know, it is a process that is going to take some time, but it is going to be very acrimonious and there will be a lot of tension and also a lot of dissension between provinces and between peoples in provinces.

The Allaire report, which has been discussed by many people here today, is something that we as Canadians have to address. While it has been stated that the report is a minimum set of conditions, I feel that Mr Bourassa has put it forward for two reasons.

First, I believe the report effectively gives him room to negotiate. He is now in control of the political agenda in Quebec, which is essential for him if he is to negotiate effectively with Canada. Second, I believe the Allaire report does not make the mistake that the Meech Lake accord did. The Meech Lake accord was a seamless web. It could not be altered afterwards and it was non-negotiable, for political as well as constitutional reasons.

The Allaire report does not have this problem in so far as to many people it is such an outrageous set of demands—and to Quebecers it is a realistic set of demands—that when compromise is achieved, it will be seen as fair, the Quebec government will be seen as flexible and everyone involved will hopefully agree that we have received an equitable agreement that is in the best interests of all Canadians. For this round will not be the Quebec round; this round will have to be the Canada round once and for all.

The dice are still rolling from the Meech Lake process. The dice will continue to roll until Quebec is brought into the constitutional fold. What can we do? What can we do as Ontarians and what can we do as Canadians to facilitate the bringing of Quebec into the Constitution and the ending of this acrimony between the provinces and between Canadians?

I believe that we must come to some sort of compromise, that there must be a certain devolution of powers from the federal government to the provincial government. I also believe that as we renegotiate Confederation, this would be the opportunity from which provincial powers could also be given to the federal government.

When the Fathers of Confederation framed the British North America Act, they did so in 1867. They were not able to foresee the problems and demands and strains that would be placed upon Confederation and the Constitution 123 or 124 years later. What we have to do in 1991 and 1992 is bring forward a renewed Constitution, a renewed

Confederation, that can address the demands that we will face in the next century.

There are many different areas where powers could be given to the provinces. First of all, look at section 91 of the BNA Act. The fisheries control could be given to the provinces. Why is it that Newfoundland has no control over fish, which is a natural resource in its eyes, whereas Alberta does have the power to control its natural resources?

Provincial provinces should also have the right to use indirect taxation. The framers of our Constitution cannot envisage the financial demands or the financial and resource base that would have to supply the financing for their programs and legislation. There will have to be a serious realignment and discussion of the federal and provincial relationship in terms of economic and financial matters.

With regard to health care, we feel that the provinces should regain their exclusive right in this field, except that the federal government must maintain a role to ensure the portability of health insurance schemes between provinces, and that certain minimum standards are kept to in every province.

1200

With regard to education, we feel that the power of the federal government to impose remedial legislation should be eliminated, yet the federal government should also gain jurisdiction over post-secondary education, presumably at a level appropriate for world-class institutions. In an era of global economies where competition and skills training are necessary for economic survival, we feel that only the federal government can design the national strategies that we will need.

Provincial governments should regain exclusive control over funding and setting standards for primary and secondary schooling. As in health care, the federal government would provide transfers to the poorer provinces to spend within the educational system in a manner that these provinces see fit.

I will make some of the recommendations that I and my co-author have come up with. We feel that the government of Ontario should wholeheartedly endorse Canada and the role of the federal government as the leading institution in our country. We also feel that the government of Ontario should emphasize not only the economic importance of Canada, but also the cultural, social and political benefits. We do not see any documents that come forward in only an economic light and we feel that it would be dangerous to do so if we look at a document and determine that it is non-negotiable simply because of the negative economic consequences on Ontario.

We further believe that a willingness to address the concerns of Premier Bourassa should be shown without, however, endorsing the reasoning of the Allaire report. If necessary, as I have said, devolution of some powers to the provinces should be made, but also some powers should be given to the federal government. We believe in a renewal of Confederation.

The government of Ontario must preserve the ability of the federal government to govern nationally and to speak for Canada with one strong voice internationally. The duality

of language and culture upon which Canada was built must be preserved. We believe this is essential to Canada. It is one of those intrinsic, intangible elements that makes Canada what it is.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms must not be diluted in any way, shape or form. In the event of the dissolution of Canada, God forbid, as we know it, all possible options for further associations must be examined, and finally, the government of Ontario must ensure that we of my generation will be able to offer the same opportunities to our children as our parents have been able to offer us.

We feel that Canada is the greatest nation on earth and we are proud to say that we are Canadians. We are prepared to defend our country in its entirety from this threat of dissolution by misunderstanding and intemperate acts. We must build bridges of trust and understanding. It is for this reason that we would prepare this brief and commit the time and energy needed to present it. It is not with heavy hearts that we have approached this task; rather, it is with a strong conviction that we can contribute in a positive manner to the debate that rages around us.

Before this debate escalates into crisis, Ontario must take a proactive stance and lead the way to a better Canada. We must become aware of those nebulous characteristics that make Canada Canada. We must translate them into a vision and articulate it to Canadians. The benefits of continued Confederation must be demonstrated to all Canadians.

Canada must address long-standing grievances between provinces and at the same time strengthen the bonds that unite us. As a former Premier of Quebec once said, "We firmly believe that through mutual respect, good faith and frank negotiations, there exists a real possibility of creating the conditions leading to a better future." We believe that Mr Lévesque had a lot of foresight.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Yours is not an easy task and we wish you the patience and fortitude necessary to complete it.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr McDonough. We appreciate your presentation. We will move on at this point. We have exhausted the time at our disposal.

LAURENT PROULX

The Chair: I invite next Laurent Proulx.

M. Proulx : «Ô Canada, terre de nos aïeux». Mes aïeux étaient ici depuis trois cents ans au moins, bien avant ceux de la plupart des Canadiens. Mes ancêtres, selon cette étude généalogique, étaient ici dans ce pays en 1673 et 1690. «O Canada, our home and native land.»

Je suis né ici dans la province même de l'Ontario en 1936 et j'accepte votre invitation de parler d'un nouveau Canada, mais ça me blesse beaucoup de voir et d'entendre une invitation comme ça devenue toute une autre chose pour les gens qui disent qu'il n'y a pas de place pour quelqu'un comme moi, un francophone hors Québec dans ce nouveau Canada, les gens comme les types à Orillia l'autre jour et les autres endroits, les gens qui disent : «Il n'y a pas de place pour moi-même», les gens qui ne sont pas capables de penser sauf en anglais, les gens de l'APEC, souvent les vieux, pas les jeunes gens. Impossible d'avoir une autre manière de vivre, de parler, de manifester les

pensées, les sentiments sauf en anglais. Ils ont peur, il me semble, de choses différentes. Ils voulaient avoir un seul pays, une seule langue et quoi d'autre ? Une seule culture, une seule religion, rien d'autre de différent ? Imaginez en réalité un Sault-Sainte-Marie unilingue. C'est possible. Bravo, c'est bien bête, même comme concept. Les gens qui pensent qu'une seule bataille sur les plaines d'Abraham of days of yore, advocates of the might-is-right diplomacy, an accident in history, a happenstance, should determine who and what shall be le Canada today. C'est tellement bon pour bâtir un pays, n'est-ce pas ? O Canada, true north strong and free, glorious and free.

Comment est-ce que je peux vivre librement sans gêne comme francophone canadien dans un pays unilingue ? En effet, j'ai deux questions fondamentales à vous poser. Premièrement, qu'est-ce que l'Ontario a fait pour moi comme francophone, quelqu'un d'une minorité linguistique jusqu'à date ? J'ai 54 ans maintenant et chaque jour de ma vie en Ontario et au Canada était presque une lutte, un effort de garder quelque chose de français, de vivre en français.

«Protégera nos foyers et nos droits» ; nos droits ? Je ne parle pas des grands événements comme la cause célèbre, Regulation 17, 1912, the law forbidding the use of French as language of instruction in Ontario schools. Not even such faraway matters as Alberta's Bill 60 removing constitutional rights to francophones in recent years. No, I speak of my childhood experiences in northern Ontario: Schumacher-Porcupine to be exact. I am a product of the Ontario public education system. I was educated in the only, albeit large, school in an gold-mining community, une école anglaise publique, a good school. I learned all about Canada's story; the British English version. I sang British songs: God Save the King, Rule Britannia, There'll Always Be an England, The Maple Leaf Forever. Remember that one?

In days of yore, from Britain's shore,
Wolfe, the dauntless hero, came,
And planted firm Britannia's flag
On Canada's fair domain.

No mention was made really of the French contribution to exploration and nation-building, nor did our native people—les indigènes, les autochtones du Canada—receive much treatment, save for some little romantic stereotypical treatment at most. I wore a navy blue beret, an SPSCC sweatshirt, short pants and a wooden rifle in our school cadet corps. I was told to "speak white" many times, even as a sensitive teenager by a school administrator.

Jusqu'à un certain âge, je trouvais ça assez normal. Imaginez ça. I soon learned that if your name was not identifiably Waspish, social mobility was only a dream. I could go on and on.

Il y a des francophones partout avec les mêmes expériences, j'en suis sûr. Tell me that I had the same opportunities as my Canadian counterparts in la belle province de Québec in educational, cultural, social, business affairs. Pas du tout.

For a while in those heady days of Canada's centennial celebrations, for once I felt good about being Canadian and francophone; no second-class citizenry feelings. But of late, with the linguistic hate that the public media seems

to highlight and promote, letters to the editors abound, anti-French, anti-Quebec; editorials like the Toronto Sun, which I do not read any more, blatantly bigoted; talk shows and phone-ins and Canadians are very good at that—are we not?—misinformed half-truths, une haine viscérale. Je me sens mal, mal à l'aise, malheur, une peine, franchement.

I find some solace, though, in l'Express de Toronto, un hebdomadaire, une fois par semaine, l'Actualité, the French Maclean's magazine, une fois par mois, le poste de radio CJBC à Toronto. Je peux faire ça n'importe quel jour. I used to be able to get French television from Toronto, CBLFT, but you know what the CBC did there, Dieu merci. TVOntario still serves me with some some émissions françaises.

Of course I have ma famille, mon fils David ici.

I feel at times like a victim of some deliberate plan for linguistic and cultural genocide: people, groups, agencies, waging a special campaign to remove things French, anything French. Shades of the early days in Ontario, Upper Canada when the wholesale changes took place on the map when Governor Colonel John Graves Simcoe changed all those Indian and French names into English names, la plupart.

1210

Ma deuxième question : qu'est-ce que l'Ontario va faire pour mon fils David ? Un autre assimilated French Canadian parmi des milliers et des milliers de francophones déjà assimilés ; j'espère que non. Mille mercis.

M. le Président : Merci à vous. Il y a quelques questions, si vous voulez répondre.

M. Proulx : Ça prend un effort d'être ici et je ne suis pas capable de répondre.

M. le Président : C'est à vous de décider. Je voudrais vous remercier au nom du comité pour votre présentation.

M. Proulx : Ça vient du coeur. Merci.

M. Bisson : Mon concitoyen de Cochrane-Sud, bonjour et bienvenue. We will revert to English because I think people need to understand what you are basically saying, and as a francophone I hear what you are saying is that—are you going to allow me a couple of seconds longer than normal? Okay. That is an inside joke.

The question is really that. The question that I think—

The Chair : I am not sure I have managed to stop you so far, Mr Bisson. Why would I start now?

Mr Bisson : You have to keep on pushing. First of all, I want to thank you for bringing a personal presentation of what assimilation means to you living in southwestern Ontario, because really that is what you are talking about. You come from the northern part of the province where in such ridings as where I come from there is a strong, vibrant francophone community that is able to live in co-existence with anglophone and other multicultural people within our community, because we understand there are no bugaboos. We are people just like everybody else here. We all have good, we all have bad, and we have something to learn from each other.

But the question is that of recognition and I want to thank you for putting that in an eloquent way. Really the whole question here is recognition of us as a people. We are people, we do have rights and it is not a question that we are asking for any more rights. We are just asking for recognition.

This is the question that I am coming to and I want you to give your personal view with regard to the question of assimilation because I understand. What you were saying is that what happens in an area such as mine at one time, just recently we got French-language education over the past 20 years up in our riding, which at the time was about 60% francophone. Communities such as Hearst which are 95% francophone still have English high schools, not able to access the francophones who are unilingual, who have to go into grade 9, having not only to learn grade 9 to 12 subjects, but learn a second language.

The thing is the question of assimilation, being here in southwestern Ontario, with regard to the services that you need as a francophone so that yourself and your son and the rest of your family are able to live what it is to be a francophone. Can you put in personal terms your personal thing in regard to what assimilation is all about and what needs to be done and what people need to understand with regard to services that need to be provided to make that happen?

Mr Proulx : What are we going to say? A lot of things have happened that give me pleasure. I am speaking now of the Ontario government. My decision to come south, to live in the south, that is my decision and I should not expect people to say, "You can bring all of your large French influence with you and expect to find the same services here." No. I live in Huron county and I have to be careful. I do not want to condemn the fine people there. They have a good educational system. The closest immersion school is in Goderich, so that is out of the question, école St Marys. So any education, which is the right of the parent first and foremost, is going to have to come from home for my son, so I shall not be depending upon the Ontario government or municipal affairs or my local community to provide that.

It would be very nice to be able to live day by day without feeling this. Maybe I am becoming paranoid. Maybe I am uttering words that have no validity, but that is my perception. I picked up the Kitchener-Waterloo Record last night again. I cannot even read the newspaper without having—and I do not react. To come here is really something.

Mr Bisson : I realize that.

M. Proulx : Ça prend plus d'une heure, the telephone calls I made to be on this agenda.

Mr Bisson : A lot of courage.

Mr Proulx : I hope I have not made a mistake.

Mr Bisson : Not at all.

Mr Proulx : I appreciate being here. I am not here to condemn; I am here to speak from the heart, du coeur. I really cannot answer that question other than to say it is a personal perspective of what you expect. I expect no more than what is already available, and you work with what is

there. I am not expecting a province bilingue. It would be nice, un rêve. No.

M. Bisson : Votre fils, est-ce qu'il parle français ?

M. Proulx : Non, ça arrive assez souvent. Non. Deutsch, non, allemand, mais ça marche ensemble. On peut vivre ensemble.

Mr Bisson: Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Monsieur Proulx. We understand the difficulty you are talking about in terms of your being here this morning and we appreciate even more so the fact that you are here.

I want to also thank all of the previous speakers for accommodating the shortened time lines because it has allowed us to have some time to use for the number of other people in groups that still want to speak to us. There are, for the members of the committee, at least five or six different groups that we still will try to get through before the morning session concludes.

I will invite next a group of students from Sir Frederick Banting Secondary School to come forward. I know they were here earlier. I hope they have not left. Are there some students from Banting secondary school still here? No? Okay, we will try later.

DIANNE HASKETT

The Chair: Could I invite next Dianne Haskett to come forward?

Ms Haskett: Good morning, members of the select committee, members of the audience. I must say it is a great privilege to be able to address this committee.

I want to divert from my prepared text for a moment to express something from my heart which is that I have a three-year-old daughter—she is almost three; she will be in April—and I cannot get it out of my mind that there may come a time in the future when she may come to me and she may say, "Mommy, what was Canada?" I will tell her what Canada was and how wonderful it was, and I will tell her how it fell apart. Then she will say to me, "Mommy, what did you do?" That is why I am here today.

I am here because of my fervent love for Canada. From the time I was a child I have known our country was special, distinctive among the nations of the world. I can still remember being only seven or eight years of age when it occurred to me that it was amazing, an incredible privilege, that I was born in Canada. I might have found myself in some desert country where there was a shortage of water, or in a war-torn country, or under a fearful, repressive regime, but no, it was Canada, the beautiful land in which I was born and raised.

1220

On the international scene, Canada has always been respected, almost ahead of any other nation, in its reputation of goodwill and tolerance. It is a country of immigrants, a safe and beautiful haven from what is often a world of turmoil, and an often ugly world. I have never been ashamed to be a Canadian. I have held my head high in my travels around the globe, when I thought of my country and of what it means to the world.

But now I am ashamed of my country, and I am ashamed of my fellow citizens. I am ashamed of the growth and expression of an attitude of gross indifference, of resignation and defeat. It is beyond excuse to treat this precious country with such carelessness and disdain. And I single out my fellow anglophones for much of my shame.

Yes, I know they may feel that Quebec has often been treated more specially and that bilingualism is forced upon us, but in fact, as has been mentioned several times this morning, there is only one entirely bilingual province in the country, and that is New Brunswick. No other province has imposed upon its citizens bilingualism in government affairs. Only federal services are provided in two official languages across the country, services such as Canada Post, immigration, the RCMP, etc.

Do not my fellow citizens understand that it is our former tolerance, our acceptance of bilingualism and our fostering of many cultures that has caused to make us be admired among the nations? We are not a part of the USA, and for all its many attributes I pray that we will never be part of the USA.

Those things which make us distinct should be celebrated and not resented. Canada has a separate destiny among the nations. It has a distinct role to play. What is it that sets us apart from the Americans? For one, we have been neither revolutionaries nor conquerors. We chose to negotiate our independence from Britain and to enter into treaties with our native peoples. We are peacemakers wherever possible, and not combatants.

This is our tradition, our reputation. We must hold fast to this tradition if we are to fulfil our destiny as a nation.

Our word is our bond, and we must not now become an untrustworthy nation that cannot honour its commitments and its treaties with its aboriginal peoples. The respect for other peoples which we have always extolled must first be granted to those who came before us. Without our native people standing side by side with our predecessors in the war of 1812, we would most likely at that time have become an unwilling part of the United States. They, the Indian tribes, fought with the British soldiers and the Canadian farmers to preserve something in which they all believed. That was a separate land with a separate history to unfold.

I want to just divert again for one, brief second to say that I know there is a group of native people who want to make an address today, and I hope that every accommodation will be made to hear them.

I have never thought of myself as an Ontarian. I am first and always a Canadian. In my travels through the province of Quebec, when my poor grasp of the French language may have brought exasperation, and yes, even rudeness to me, I have never received it as from a stranger, but as from a brother or a sister. We may not understand each other fully and we may not communicate fully, but the Québécois are my brothers and sisters. We belong to the same family and as in family squabbles, hurts run very deep.

Before any constitutional changes are considered or recommended, we must first seek a healing of the hearts and minds of people, not with a torrent of government

newspeak but straight from the hearts of regular people an expression of how they feel about this country.

We must get the message to Quebec and to our native peoples that we care, that we are sorry that they have been hurt, but that the rest of Canada is hurting too, and that we would like to sit down together and work out our differences. I know some may say I am naïve to believe that a common denominator to the difficulties we face is emotional distress. But Benoît Bouchard recently stated that, "Emotionally, Quebecers have already left." If we fail to deal first with the heart and soul of the nation, we will never meet with success by any other means.

A grave problem facing Canadians is their weariness with it all. Pope Pius once said in an Easter message, "The danger of today is the weariness that afflicts the good." Canadians are weary. They are weary of criticism, of browbeating, of self-interest and of egotism, and many are becoming resigned to a sense of hopelessness and despair.

Those of us who care and are not prepared to give in to this weariness must energize the others around us. We have been going through what H. G. Wells, in his *Outline of History*, called a "fatigue phase." He wrote, "A lack of fresh initiative is characteristic of a fatigue phase; everyone, for sheer inability to change, drifts on for a time along the lines of mental habit and precedent." We need to break out of that mould. We need to pay heed to the words of the Hebrew prophet, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." The late Lester B. Pearson, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, said that in seeking after solutions for the future, "patience, strength, prudence and vision are the four qualities" to guide our way.

Our problem is not a language barrier and transfer payments. It is not regional disparity or land claims, or even the GST. It is the approaching death of a vision for all that Canada can be. Professor Arnold Toynbee stated that society is never defeated by outside pressures of attack unless it first defeats itself by a disintegration from within. Some of the members of this audience who remember the old Pogo comic strip might remember the sequence where Pogo said, "We have found the enemy, and the enemy is us." If this is true, then the real struggle is not to work out the intricate details of a compartmentalized and fractured Canada, but to come back first, face to face, with what we are, with what we have become, and with what we want to be.

This is not a time for grasping, for selfishness. This is only self-destructive. It is rather a time for compromise and for understanding. The push for major constitutional revision is premature. It will stay premature until such time as enough good faith can be mustered across this land, in all its regions, until Canadians en masse can come to some point where they realize what they truly cherish.

We need fresh vision, fresh hope, fresh courage to approach the days ahead. To approach the ominous future with nothing but a sense of foreboding, is to bring sure destruction.

In these times, many say, "Where is our leadership?" and they lay all of the blame on our Prime Minister for our lack of vision. But that it the biggest copout there is. The responsibility rests on more shoulders than one. We all bear the responsibility, but particularly the people in leader-

ship positions like yourselves, and the Premiers, and the judges, and the MPs and the senators of our land, and the heads of labour, and of industry and of religion.

Where is our leadership to lead us through these times? You all have a responsibility at your various levels to help us raise the standard of conduct of Canadians, to inspire us to be better than ourselves, to help us rise above the pettiness and seek the common good, to once again believe in the sublime and that it is worth attaining.

1230

I believe in the future of Canada, and I believe enough in Canadians to rally to the occasion, to forgive old grudges, to let heal the wounds of the past, to cast off cynicism and to stand up for this beautiful land. But it will take the whole country to seize the vision. It must be separate and apart from party politics, or cultural or religious differences, or barriers of language or race. It must be felt as one, and it can be so. But it will require those Canadians who now do care but have in the past been willing to be armchair Canadians to rouse themselves and come forth into their neighbourhoods and communities and waken their fellow citizens to the challenge. We need to mobilize as we never have, we need to cast off our personal cares and stand up for the common good. If we all do this, we will be the recipients of the reward—for the reward is the future of Canada itself. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Haskett. We will have one brief question.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Your daughter will not be disappointed in you. I am so happy that you have put in historical perspective, accurate historical perspective, the noble values and sometimes the suffering that we as Canadians have had to come together with over the last 123 years. Some people hark back for the good old days. You have described the good old days with their struggles and with the input of all these people that make up the Canadian nation. I think right now that with our visions and our hopes, we tend to be in park rather than in drive, and I really feel you have given us the challenge. I would like you to say a little more about how you think this committee can help in the efforts you so well described.

Ms Haskett: When John Donne said no man is an island, I think he was addressing something like what we are facing in Canada now, in that the loss of one province will be the death of the country. When I put whatever deep thought I can into what would be solutions, and how we can mobilize the citizenry to really do something, to really heal the wounds, not only of the past but the tremendous wounds of the present—as Mr Proulx mentioned, every day he picks up the newspaper there is another wound—I think what we need to do is to reduce it right down to our own villages and cities and communities. What the Ontario government could do is to help mobilize citizen groups in their own communities to be able to have a greater expression of goodwill between themselves and other communities.

For example, I come from London—my ancestors helped to settle the city. Our sister city is Quebec City, and I think a lot more could be made of that. I would like to see whole family exchanges, not just teenagers going from

one family to the other in the opposite provinces, but whole family exchanges, with all the publicity of the local government and the provincial government. All of the goodwill that goes with friendship, that you can never get out of a lot of government propaganda, I think could begin to be fostered from one city to another to another around the province and maybe around the country. There is not enough understanding because people have never really stepped into the shoes of the other people they disdain, so I think it has to be on a more personal level.

It does not need to be done with great government budgets. I would not want a lot of people appointed with large salaries, but rather people who would be willing to serve voluntarily to co-ordinate efforts of goodwill. I really believe there is so much goodwill out there, which maybe this committee is not hearing; you hear people from interest groups. I have been ashamed to hear even some of the things said here today. I can tell you there is a whole populace out there who care very deeply but do not have the courage to come forward, and we need to mobilize that populace.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for helping us make our opportunity for choice.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Haskett.

JOANNE GOURS

The Chair: Joanne Gours?

Ms Gours: My name is Joanne Gours. I am a resident of London, and I am honoured to be here to present to you this afternoon.

What I would like to talk about is our cultural identity here in Canada. I am going to focus on mutual respect, whether it be aboriginal language, French language or whatever. One thing you have not focused on is the language and culture of the deaf community, and this is what we would like; we would like respect from you as well. We would like respect for American Sign Language as our first language. As we grew up, if we came from deaf families, we used American Sign Language as our first language.

We have different roles, hearing and deaf people. We are looked down upon by the hearing community here in Canada. Most deaf people wish hearing people could understand us more in depth, because we have the same feelings and emotions as you do.

Colleges here in Canada, for example: Recently a deaf woman was fortunate enough to be accepted into Fanshawe College as opposed to going to the United States to take courses down there. We do not want to have our opportunities looked down upon, in terms of us taking courses here in Canada that would help us gain future employment. We wish to be looked upon as peers within the colleges. We need governmental support for the colleges so that deaf men and women are able to take courses at the community college level or at the university level as opposed to being forced to go to the United States to take these courses. Of course, we need trained teachers of the deaf who are aware and familiar with deaf culture.

Across Canada, interpreters also are an issue. We would like to see a government grant given to the Canadian Hearing Society here in Ontario. The reason is that

we need a 24-hour interpreting service for emergencies. We are very frustrated over that issue. This is something in great demand: a 24-hour emergency interpreting service. We also need more staff to provide interpreting services for a variety of different circumstances. Right now the interpreting services are limited but we need them for whatever, for emergencies, various appointments such as employment-related, etc.

In terms of employment here in Canada, we require employers to hire deaf individuals as workers and we require devices to assist us, for example, telephones that are accessible, safety devices, things of that nature.

We also need changes to the testing given, say, at Canada Post. We need a test that would be given to deaf potential employees as opposed to the regular test. For example, we need more time to do the test. In my example of the post office, or government ministries, whatever, deaf people may wish to apply for these jobs and are given a test to complete, but they find it is extremely difficult and do not have equal access to that as their hearing counterparts. They need to have the questions given to them in a different fashion and they need more time to complete the test and have it made clearer to them what is expected on the test. We need more time, because the interpreter is going to be interpreting the test and we would have to watch the interpreter interpret the question and then look down at our paper and answer the question, which takes more time; we cannot listen to a question being read out loud and write at the same time. We are using two mediums: We are watching the interpreter and then we are focusing on written English to respond to the question.

Deaf people have requirements in terms of their background, education or whatever, but governments and agencies continue to look down upon them when they are in an employment situation and not allow them the same opportunity for promotions as their hearing counterparts. We need funding put into the educational system to educate people more in depth in terms of deafness so that employers will be able to see what deaf people can do. Gary Malkowski is a perfect example of that. Deaf people feel we need to be looked upon equally as our hearing counterparts, and we need to educate people to that.

That is what I wanted to say to you this afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Gours. Are there other questions? Thank you very much.

1240

N'AMERIND FRIENDSHIP CENTRE

The Chair: Could I call next Ron Mercier and Donna Phillips from the N'Amerind Friendship Centre.

Mr Mercier: There has been a change here. This is Roslynn McCoy. She is the executive director for the N'Amerind centre. I am Ron Mercier.

Before we start, I would like to tell you a couple of stories. They are short stories, but I think they are very significant.

Perhaps the committee would close their eyes just for a moment to see the darkness of the night. It is a clear cool night in northern Ontario, with the moon coming up from

the east and the stars of the Milky Way shining brightly. Count the number of stars. It cannot be done. There are millions of them. That is how long creation has been.

The second thing I would like you to think of is how long the white man has been here on this land. A couple of hundred years. And this is how long it has taken to bring our lands to ruin. Something to think about.

Another story I would like to tell is the story of an elder, sitting on a log near a meadow in the bush in northern Ontario, or anywhere in Canada for that matter. The old man is enjoying his pipe. He is enjoying the peace and the quiet of the wilderness. A white man comes along and says to the elder, "Could you please push over so I could sit beside you?" The elder says, "Yes, I will," and he accommodates the white man. As the old man is enjoying his pipe, the white man is a little uncomfortable, so again he says to the elder, "Could you please push over a bit so that I may sit a little more comfortably?" And the elder smoking gently on his pipe enjoying the wilderness accommodated the white man and he moved over a little more. A little more time went by, and again, the white man, feeling uncomfortable, asked the elder, "Could you please move over a little more so I may be a little more comfortable?" At this the elder accommodated him and fell off the log he was sitting on. Not knowing what to do, the elder picked his pipe and stood in front of the white man and said, "Could you please let me sit on the log?" The white man said: "No, I'm sorry. There's no room for you on this log." Another story you must think about.

Ros is going to make a short presentation on behalf of the N'Amerind centre.

Ms McCoy: First, N'Amerind would like to share much dissatisfaction with the committee and its organizers for the lack of consideration given to native people of this community and area. Our dissatisfaction is specific to the notice given. These hearings were made known to us on 18 February, by a phone call made to myself. This did not allow appropriate time for preparation of what you absolutely need to hear from us. There is something drastically amiss when I had to contact David Winninger last night in order for us to voice our concern over a refusal evidenced yesterday to be placed on the agenda for today. This refusal came from a schedule co-ordinator, telling us that all time slots were filled and we would have to present at Kitchener.

At this point, it was made known to me that there were no native presentations scheduled and obviously no room for any. London, seated in the heart of southwestern Ontario, is home to five native organizations and is central to nine surrounding first nation communities, yet we are the only native organization coming here this morning to be scheduled so far. Supporters are not to be misinterpreted as native organizations, nor do they speak on our behalf. Also, our organization will not speak for other native communities and organizations in this area, and you must understand this.

The short notice is unfair and counterproductive to the purpose of these hearings. Your committee will not totally benefit due to the lack of native representation based on the lack of consideration afforded us. Obviously, some one

needs to pull up his socks and take a serious look at the slight that has been extended to us, and maybe a look at how serious this new government is about establishing and nurturing a strengthful relationship with the aboriginal people of this province. Is this going to be an issue?

We would like to share the following. Ontario and Canada must recognize that aboriginal people are the first inhabitants of this land and must be recognized as such, as opposed to the English and French who stumbled upon us. Ontario must exercise a broadened vision with respect to aboriginal people. Ontario must establish a strengthful and productive relationship with urban native people. Ontario must provide assurances that an effective consultation process with urban native people is established as a result of consultation with us. Ontario must also facilitate mechanisms to ensure that the needs of urban native people are addressed, again as a result of consultation with us. Government must take an inventory of its services and existing bodies within ministerial departments to afford recognition of urban native involvement. An example might be the role of the Indian Commissioner of Ontario. Ontario must continue its supportive leader role in any constitutional discussions concerning aboriginal people as well.

1250

As a conclusionary statement, because of what we just expressed to you and the time to prepare, it is our mutual responsibility, all of us, to ensure that all concerns, issues and needs are addressed. Governments must listen. You must listen. You must hear what we are saying and act upon all human and environmental needs to allow all healing and all fixing that has to take place.

I am going to share some personal information with you. I spoke to a group of London regional parole and probation workers last week. I was their keynote speaker here in London and I shared with them what our role has been, what my generation and some generations before me and the generations after me are being and will be.

I told them a little bit about myself and said that I was a university student in the late 1960s in the United States, and all of the social consciousness and change that was happening at that time I participated in, the thinking that was going on with my generation, everything that was happening then. Some of you may remember that. Some of you committee members I know remember that.

At one time I went home from university, and a lot of native people in the United States were becoming highly visible. A lot of things started happening. I said to my parents: "Why didn't you fight? Why didn't my grandparents fight?" I laid blame on them, on their generations, and I had to take a long look and learn that they did fight. They fought for survival against all odds historically.

My mother was forced to learn English at age five in Buffalo, New York. She was born on the Six Nations reserve outside of Brantford. She spoke fluent Mohawk but she no longer can speak her language because of the assimilation and genocidal policies of governments on both sides of the border. They grew up through times when it was illegal for Indians to speak our own languages. There were laws in the United States and there were various acts here as well that prohibited that.

They grew up in a time when it was illegal for our peoples to practise our own religions, and when it was illegal for groups of Indians of three or more to gather in public. They grew up during the time back in the 1920s when the United States decided that American Indians were citizens. They saw that. They experienced all of the social injustices that accompanied that thinking, that attitude and those laws. I told the group last week here in London that they did fight. They fought a battle that I have not experienced, not to that extent. I said, "They fought so hard for survival, it allowed me the opportunity to sit here and express it now."

I told the group what we are continually trying to do is fix it, do the healing. We are trying to enhance the healing of those who were raised in boarding schools from kindergarten till the time that they graduated from high school and were forced to be taken away from their families by Indian agents in all of North America. They lost their language; their language was taken away from the children. Their hair was cut, their clothes were changed, they were denied their religion. Who promoted that but government?

Now we are trying to fix it. Ron is trying to fix it. Ros is trying to fix it. Don is trying to fix it. Dave hopefully will help us fix it. All of N'Amerind and native communities, in and around London and everywhere, are trying to fix it. But in order to do that, you must listen to what we have to say. It cannot be your way. It has to be our way because we are the people who know who we are. We are Indian people. We have our own culture, our own languages, and we will continue to have our own identity. Our culture will live long, and we will see that that is never taken away.

Thank you very much. That is all I have to share. We will be submitting a complaint paper, forwarding it to the committee. We were not sure until you called us that we were going to absolutely be placed on the agenda. Dave said we would be, and others were trying to place us and we felt a slight. I asked the questions: Were other chiefs called? Were notes sent, or memos? Was there a schedule? There was none.

We felt that we needed to express our dissatisfaction and some key points to you today, if anything. Obviously, if you look around, you are not going to see chiefs walking through the door today. You are not going to see other organizations here. I am not sure if other organizations are aware. Unfortunately, this will not help your efforts. Anyway, we thank you for allowing us the time finally. And thanks, Dave.

The Chair: Let me just say on behalf of the committee, first of all, we apologize for the inconvenience and particularly for the slight that you have pointed out. I want to assure you that the moment I became aware of your interest in speaking to us, I said that we would accommodate your speaking to us. I will check to see what happened in both the outreach and the scheduling, and I have taken note of the comments that you made. We have made some efforts to try to reach out to the various constituencies of the province in our outreach, and I do not know what happened in this particular community. I just want you to understand that I am very conscious, as the Chair of

the committee, of the comments that you have made, and we will do whatever we can to rectify that.

I also want to assure you that we have heard throughout the province from a number of native groups and native bands, so that the issues that you have put before us are issues that are becoming clearer and clearer to us. I think the last comment that you made that we need to listen to what you have to say to us about the way in which we are going to fix some of these problems is something that has been registered very clearly with us as a committee and has struck a very positive response within the members of our committee.

We understand very clearly that that is the only way in which the solutions are going to be found. We do not expect that through this process we are going to find all the answers. What we do expect and hope is that we can begin that process of reconciliation that needs to happen with discussions that need to be ongoing until we come up with solutions that are acceptable to all of us. I just wanted to say that to you in concluding.

1300

Mr Mercier: I wonder if I could say one last thing.

The Chair: Sure.

Mr Mercier: I look around the table and I see reasonably young people. In our native communities, we honour our elders and respect our elders very much. Without our elders, we would not have the traditions and the cultures that we have. We would not have the clean lands that we are trying to keep and we would not have any of our traditions. I am wondering and hoping that perhaps the white society would have a look at its elders and go to them for some direction on which way you should go, because they are some of the most important people. They know. They have been there. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

JANET COLLINS

The Chair: I am going to call the final speaker for this session, Janet Collins. Ms Collins, come forward.

Ms Collins: This is somewhat of a pleasant surprise. I had not expected to have the opportunity to address you. I am delighted.

First, I would like to add my comments to those of others who might have commented on the time frame within which we have been invited to volunteer our participation. I realize that this committee has constraints imposed on it which have forced it into the actions it has taken, but it is those very constraints which I feel are somewhat counterproductive to the exercise in which we are all engaged. While obviously we must recognize the deadlines which have been imposed, I would urge that those deadlines be made part of the discussion, to bring some rational consideration to bear upon what it is we are actually engaged upon.

I would also like to preface my remarks by commenting on some of the earlier speakers' comments today. I am proud to join in this process as a Canadian and I am proud of my fellow Canadians who have participated today. Whatever sentiments people have expressed, it is the participation

which is important here. The feelings we all share are what is important. It is not so much the intellectual exercise. We could all do that by writing papers and sending them around. It is the fact that we felt sufficiently strongly about this event to come forward and say our two words, that is what makes me proud of all of us who have come here today.

When I was four or five years old, one day a really frightening thing happened to me. I discovered that one of my teeth was loose. I did not know what to do, so I went to my older brother and I said, "Look here, look at this," and he said: "Relax, don't worry about it. If you just keep wiggling it with your tongue or your finger, it will fall out, or maybe one day it will fall out in your dinner. You'll get another tooth in its place." I continued to do as my brother recommended, see if it was still there, wiggle it around and so on. You know what happened.

Let's move the clock, the calendar many, many years forward. In 1968, I arrived in Canada as an immigrant from Jamaica. Since my arrival, there has seldom been a time when there has not been some rumbling, some ferment, some public discussion about the need to change relations in Canada, mostly the need to change relations between Quebec and other parts of Canada.

As one who has chosen to be a Canadian and been given the opportunity to exercise that choice, this unrest has been at times stimulating, other times challenging, but currently profoundly disturbing. More so because I am on the verge of feeling that it will never, ever go away. Now this is a terrible situation in which to live. Many have used the analogy of the family and the prospect of divorce and it has its uses, particularly because it is in the realm of emotions and the hopelessness that one can experience if it is anticipated that this discussion will never reach a culmination, a resolution and we move on to other things.

That loose tooth is still there, difficult to ignore, irritating to the mouth and still not yet quite ready to fall out. The question is, will the new tooth have to erupt and push the loose tooth out or will the tooth fall freely, leaving a gap behind? No doubt in time, one assumes, a new tooth will grow.

I would like to say something about my personal view. This is why I am here. I am not a political scientist, I am nobody. I am just a citizen who wants to tell you that I feel it is important for each and every Canadian to react and interact in this process. I did not want anybody on this committee to think that I did not care and therefore here I am.

During the debate on the Meech Lake accord, I felt a sense of hopelessness until somebody who could articulate my views of what the country I chose to live in came forward. There were many people who disagreed with that view. There are many epithets attached to that spokesman, but at the end of the day, it was my feeling that it was to the credit of those responsible that the Meech Lake Accord met its demise. The reason I felt that way is that it seemed to me that that accord was flawed, not only because of what it stood for, its substance, but more so because of the manner in which the accord had been accomplished.

At the end of the day I felt that people objected to the accord because it was intended to bring about fundamental

changes in my country, our country, without our having had any meaningful opportunity to understand or agree upon those changes. Those of us who understood it to mean that it would accord special status to the province of Quebec had grave misgivings because we could not understand how the preservation of the language and culture of one set of people required that the fundamental freedom of another set of people to communicate in the language of their choice had to be suppressed.

1310

We could not agree to a country in which the Charter of Rights and Freedoms did not apply to one part of the country. Some of us could not understand why a culture that could proudly withstand any threat of submersion from the United States of America next door could nevertheless require suppressive measures against other Canadians whose language of choice happened to be something else.

Some of us could not understand why, so long after Confederation, the issues most vital to the survival and wellbeing of Canada's native peoples are still being avoided at gunpoint in places like Oka. With these thoughts in my mind, some of us applauded Clyde Wells and Elijah Harper, for we felt that, thanks to their efforts, people like me would now have an opportunity to speak to this committee, or committees like it, across the country as to our views and feelings on our Constitution. One thing that I hope this committee understands today is the very deep feeling that people have for this country and about the attempts, or the perceived attempts, to dismantle it.

What this committee needs to be concerned with is the shape of our country, whether or not the worst happens and the people of Quebec choose to separate. For, in the end, I am convinced that the choice will be made by the people of Quebec, and that is something we must confront.

It is my view that in an organized and democratic society such as we have here, there is an underlying assumption that we consent to be governed by the rules by which we are governed. It is a function and a consequence of our education in this society that each of us, at some stage believes, that we have some choice in the matter of our governments. I want to have a choice in the decision as to how my Constitution is going to be altered and my country is going to be governed.

If my consent to be governed is to have any meaning, I want it first understood that no government which I have elected or which my society has elected to decide upon the price of cheese should have, or take unto itself, the power to restructure my country without asking me about it. No Premier of this province has the right to negotiate behind closed doors to make fundamental changes to my country without my knowledge or participation.

The debate over the constitutional change has been fuelled, as it seems to me, by two separate forces. On the one hand, there has been the drive by the province of Quebec to accrete more and special powers to itself as a province within Confederation. That drive now appears to be culminating in a drive to withdraw from the federation altogether. On the other hand, there has been a chorus of demands to restructure the federation so that provincial governments will end up with additional powers at the

expense of a vastly weaker central government. This, it seems to me, was at the heart of the Meech Lake fiasco.

I believe that the lesson of Meech Lake, in regard to the substance of the proposed changes, is that there is no unanimous conviction that the central government ought to be weakened. A strong central government is essential to maintain a sense of one country and of national unity. The Prime Minister has said that he intends to restructure Canada. Some of the symbols of a united country have already been cut down by this government, and I fear that the result of this restructuring will be a country in which there will be no common values, no common standards, and very little that binds us together.

I believe that there has been altogether too much concentration on power and too little on responsibilities. Giving more power to provincial governments will not necessarily improve the lot of the residents of those provinces, for such improvement will depend on how the provincial government responds to the needs of the people.

To take an example in the field of health, we have seen the use of the federal power to control women's choices regarding the termination of pregnancies. We have seen the Supreme Court of Canada decree that the use of such powers must be limited. Following the decisions of the court in the Morgentaler and the Daigle cases, it begins to seem clear that provincial governments have the power and the responsibility to allow women to make those choices equally available across this country. But clearly while having the power to do so, some provinces have chosen not to make this difficult choice available to its citizens. Happily, Ontario is not among those provinces.

The Chair: Ms Collins, if you could sum up, we are beyond the time allowed.

Ms Collins: Okay. As far as the means of change is concerned, I think other people have spoken to details of the process much more eloquently than I could. What I would like this committee to recall, however, is that much of the debate has focused on the notion of the founding peoples, and the reason I felt it important that I should be here today is to say, "I'm not from the founding peoples," but when I was singing with my mother "Rule Britannia," we enjoyed it enormously because the lines, "Britons never, never shall be slaves," applied to us. We were British. I was born British. My great grandfather was a slave, ha, ha, ha. Well, here I am.

I chose Canada because this country has a future. An earlier speaker addressed the issue of multiculturalism. If that is to have any meaning, please include me in it. When the notion that we must have Quebec because of the diversity it contributes to Canada is considered, please remember that with or without Quebec, the diversity is here and we are not going to go away. So please factor us into your considerations. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Collins. I think if one thing has become clear to us as a committee is that we need to factor in all of those realities of Canada today. Thank you very much for your presentation.

We will end this morning or early afternoon session at this point.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Why so early?

The Chair: Why so early, someone asks. We will try to come back as close to 2 o'clock as we can to resume with the list and end our session here in London. Thank you very much to all the speakers so far.

The committee recessed at 1319.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1420.

The Chair: If the members of the committee could take their seats we will resume.

On behalf of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, I want to welcome those who are here in the audience today. "Here," of course, for those people following us over the parliamentary channel, is London, Ontario, at the Western Fair Paddock, where we have had since 9:30 this morning a number of interesting and fascinating presentations made to us. We have heard from about 15 different people, individuals and organizations, and we have a number of other speakers on our list this afternoon.

As I did this morning, I will ask those people presenting to bear with us and try to be as brief as they can in their comments. We would like to ask individuals to try to keep their comments to under 10 minutes and organizations under 20 minutes. That will allow a little time for some questions, and it will also allow us the opportunity to try to add some of the other organizations and individuals that have asked to speak.

We have some deadlines and some cut-off times this afternoon because of the need to move on to Kitchener this evening. We will try our best to accommodate the speakers but, as I said, we will also need people's co-operation in doing that. We appreciated having that this morning; that made it possible for us to add some speakers to the list.

I would like to call at this point Harold Koehler and June MacLaurin from the London Native Rights Support Group.

[Interruption]

The Chair: If there is a chance they will come back, we can come back to them.

JOHN RUSSELL

The Chair: John Russell?

Mr Russell: I have copies I wanted to give out.

The Chair: If you would bring them up to the clerk, we will get them distributed while you are speaking. While Mr Russell is doing that, I would make the same comment for any of the other presenters who are here. If you have briefs, if you provide them to the clerk we will have them distributed to the members of the committee.

Mr Russell: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, I would like to thank the committee for the opportunity to address you this afternoon.

I hope this committee does not treat this exercise as one in which the people can have their beefs aired and forgotten. I hope the views expressed by myself and my fellow citizens are given as much weight in your decision-making process as the views of our far too numerous constitutional experts. I imagine some of you wonder sometimes why we, as elected officials, put so much faith in the experts and rely so little on the common sense God has given us. Personally, I have made a serious effort as a councillor to rely more on my ratepayers' and my own judgement than the sweet-sounding songs of specialists.

Leadership and democracy fail when the views of the people are ignored. We must not repeat the mistakes of the past when constitutional change has been attempted in kitchens and behind closed doors. The people must have some good judgement because they elected you. Think about that and give them a chance.

Canada is at a crossroads and I am sure many of us do not know why it is there. It is obvious that the impasse reached by the federal government and the provinces after the collapse of Meech Lake must be broken. We cannot survive as a viable federation much longer if we do not deal with our constitutional problems.

But we are also faced with a flawed free trade agreement with the United States that restricts efforts to strengthen federal standards, programs or cultural strengths. We wonder how our leaders could have done such a good job of making one hell of a mess in such a fine country in so short a time. But it is done and it is time to set it right.

During my adult life and for many years before, our nation has been trying to set in place a constitutional framework. Most of the time has been spent trying to deal with the issue of Quebec and its uniqueness. I have supported the national policy of bilingualism. I still do, but the time has come to say enough. We can and must make a special place for Quebec in our Confederation. We must support their efforts to preserve their cultural and linguistic heritage, but we must draw the line when it comes to giving these powers to the other provinces, we must draw the line when it is suggested that the other powers desired by Quebec should be given to all the provinces. It is a recipe for disaster. The process of balkanization envisioned by the critics of Meech Lake would begin sooner or later. All efforts to keep us from finalizing our economic union with the United States would fall on deaf, powerful provincial premiers' ears. We would lose the reason to exist as a country.

I suppose that the potential for disaster and the threat of a referendum in Quebec makes for good political poker. I suggest that we call the bluff and let the referendum begin. The cost of independence is an issue that the people of la belle province can decide themselves.

We should prepare ourselves for a potential declaration of independence by strengthening our ties to the rest of the country and our definition of nationhood. We could, and many will, fight the good federalist battle one more time in Quebec. We can extol the benefits of staying in a strong Confederation, which are obvious, but we must also prepare a list of the costs of exiting. The share of the national deficit, the need to redefine the legal borders and the virtues of having a Third World currency and economy in a cultural haven must be outlined. And when the coercion is over with and the referendum has decided our fate, we must be ready.

Ontario is the only hope for keeping Canada together with Quebec or in a new arrangement without them. We have derived the lion's share of benefits from this Confederation

and we have shared with our fellow provinces the benefits through equalization payments. But it is not enough. We are too large, seen by some as too protective of our power, and are very good at controlling federal agendas for our province's benefit. We must make the effort to share more of this power, and we have the means. We can agree to a second-tier federal elected assembly that reflects equality for the regions, an assembly that has the power to subdue excesses of representative democracy. We must assure our native people that there will be a place for them at the table at any and all discussions. And that place will lead to a form of self-government that is municipal in nature yet enshrined in a federal Constitution. We must be unafraid to change the amending formula to allow constitutional reform to take place.

Ontario needs to lead the way. We must forcefully reaffirm our belief in a strong federal system. We need to stop talking about dividing the pie of government power and start designing a new way. We need to ignore the power seekers, the power brokers and the entrenched bureaucrats and start to listen to the people. We need to define our nation's goals and put in place a government structure that can meet these challenges. We do not need to be timid or tied to a definition of democracy that has its roots in British parliamentary traditions. We should explore all forms of representative government and make a model that is ours and ours alone, one that is responsive to all the people, efficient and effective in its distribution of responsibilities among the three levels of government and preserves its integrity by a series of checks and balances. If we are going to talk about a new Canada, a new Confederation and a new deal, then let us do the job right.

I challenge this committee to show the leadership this province and this country needs. Do not use this committee's hearings and its report as a public relations exercise, a way of placating the masses. Stand up for a strong Canada that is not afraid of rebirth. Prepare the agenda for a renewed federalism that the people who elected you can participate in. Ignore your experts and look to your hearts. It may surprise you, but the passion is there. The question is: Will you use it? I hope so.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Russell. I think the challenge you pose to us in your concluding comments is one we all recognize. I hope we can meet it.

Mr Bisson: A very quick question with regard to how we in Ontario feel towards federalism. It is something I am starting to grasp because of the presentations we have been getting. One of the things we say here in Ontario is that we believe strongly in federalism, but we hear in different regions of the country that people put less belief in federalism than we do. Is that maybe a reflection that we have done fairly well by federalism here in Ontario, and some of the other regions of the country, the western part, the north, Quebec, etc, have not felt equally as benefited? Can you respond to that?

1430

Mr Russell: What is your question?

Mr Bisson: I am saying that basically we have done fairly well in Ontario under the federalist system we have

now, yet we hear other places in the country, the western provinces, the far north, Quebec, the Maritimes, speak about problems they have with federalism. I am just wondering if you can comment on that, and then I can come to the second part.

Mr Russell: The only thing I can say about that is that I have lived my whole life in Ontario. Two of my sisters left 15 years ago and live in the west. One of the things that irritates me about having any family reunions now is this anti-Ontario thing. I believe I am a Canadian first. I can never remember saying I am an Ontarian. My sisters, the one who lives in BC and the one who lives in Alberta, consider themselves Albertans and British Columbians, which to me are strange, hybrid beasts in a national country. But they have that attitude, I think, because of the disparity of Confederation. Historically, it has been proven—I cannot use the term “rape,” but I think Ontario has done well by Confederation because we are the engine that runs things, and we started it all. So I do not know—

Mr Bisson: But do not—

The Chair: Sorry, Mr Bisson, I am going to move on to the next questioner.

Mr Offer: Thank you, Mr Russell. Running through your brief is the faith in the necessity for a strong central government, but at the same time—I hope I am not misreading—the necessity for a redefined form of federalism, be that in a change in some powers and the responsibilities between the province and the federal government.

My question is about something which is not contained in your brief, but I would like to get your opinion on this. We have had a number of people from all parts of the province come before us and talk to us about the usefulness of referendums or plebiscites in reaching out to the population at large in this province. You have spoken about referendums in Quebec, and I am wondering if you might have an opinion about whether there is or is not a place for referendums or plebiscites in Ontario.

Mr Russell: I think there is. When I suggest in my last part of the brief that we rethink Canada, I think we should clean the slate. I think there are too many vested interests. You are elected officials: You have vested interests in your seats, the next election. We have MPs who are in the same position and we have senators who are in the same position. Behind those people we have large federal as well as provincial bureaucracies. They all have vested interests.

I think we should have a referendum to ask the people of Canada: Do we want a country any more, and what form of country should that be? Because whenever I have had a discussion with anybody who has any political background and then I go and compare that to somebody with no political background, it is amazing the difference in their view of it. A person who has no political background will always talk about service and value for the dollar. In other words, what is government to them? It is a vehicle. At the lower level, at the municipal level where I operate, it is something where we get water services or garbage pick-up, or whatever. At the larger level, they look at it as, “You take my income tax,” and you people are in between. But it is on that level.

The political—you always get the obscure answer, you always get the condescending comments, but they are protecting their buns, as far as I am concerned. We have had this Confederation for a long time; it has served us well. I do not think the model is right any more and I do not believe we should be having discussions about changing the shape of federalism without asking the people: Do we want a federal form of government? Do we want a provincial form that is secondary to it? Do we want checks and balances? Do we want a British parliamentary system? I think we have to put the cart in its rightful spot—put the horse ahead of it. Ask the people what they want.

I understand that Mr Mulroney, as recently as a week ago, suggested that a referendum was out of the question when it comes to the idea of an amending formula. My feeling on that is that we waited three years to get Meech passed. We had how many provincial elections which changed governments, people like you? And we ended up not even getting to that point, because it was not quite right. I think people should have the say before we allow you people to continue with your work.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Russell. We will end there.

HARRY RUDOLFS

The Chair: Could I call next Harry Rudolfs?

Mr Rudolfs: My name is Harry Rudolfs. I am a producer of a public affairs program for a cable station in St Thomas, and I have a videotape to present. This is the covering letter from the videotape.

What is the future of Canada? In response to the troubling issues surrounding the future of our community, Allview Cable of St Thomas made its studio facilities available to those individuals wishing to comment on the problems facing modern Canada. Advertisements were run on the cable channel and a local journalist made mention of this opportunity in the St Thomas Times-Journal. As well, input was sought from the youth of the community, and St Thomas's three public high schools were approached and asked to send representatives. Participants were asked to gather at the station on 7 February 1991 and were each given five minutes before the camera to record their views and to offer constructive solutions.

The resulting one-hour video is a distillation of the opinions of 14 members of the community. Although not a completely scientific survey, we believe this product is a fairly accurate cross-section of the concerns of our region.

A second hour was devoted to a panel discussion with four invited guests. The panelists were chosen because of their expertise on various aspects of the Constitution. The members of the panel were as follows: Wayne Paddon, historian and author of many books on regional history; William Johnson, a well-respected defence counsel and expert in constitutional law; Jennie Jack, a Tlingit Indian, a third-year law student at the University of British Columbia and a native land claims consultant; and John Atkin, an educator and long-time resident of Quebec.

Questions for this group were chosen from the discussion points taken from the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future and from the discussion paper distributed by the

select committee on Ontario in Confederation. The questions dealt with the values of Canadians, what role Quebec has to play in Confederation, bilingualism, the restructuring of the present federalist system and native land claims and aspirations.

It is hoped that by providing a videotape, this committee will be saved time and that the information contained in these tapes is of an efficient and precise nature. Instead of having 18 people making submissions in different packages, our representation can be more easily be tasted as a whole fruit rather than a piece of rind.

As I served as moderator for both these sessions, I feel qualified to briefly summarize some recurring themes. There was a surprising amount of interest in bilingualism. Many people stated that bilingualism and more education could close the gap between the English and French families. As Janet Medlyn said, "Quebec has to accept English Canada and Canada has to accept bilingualism."

At the same time, the rest of Canada cannot be "held hostage," an often-repeated term, by Quebec. Michael Harrison stated, "Canada needs to define the breadth of its expectations," and that if the provinces want a new realignment of power sharing, they have to expect to give up something as well. If rights are extended to one province or region, they have to be applied to them all.

Most people felt that the present federal system is not working. The problem seems to lie in the fact that there is no leadership to define a new Canadian vision, that the people to bring about that change are nowhere on the horizon. There appeared to be a perception that what is needed is regional representation within a strong federalist system. More than one person said that Meech Lake should not be considered an utter failure, but that we should try again with everyone at the table—without prioritization, I may add. Wayne Paddon mentioned that our present system was put together at a time when we were in a hurry to form a country because of the threat of the US and that it does not work any more and is based on a 17th-century model.

There was much concern that native aspirations have not been addressed. Bill Johnson said in regard to land claims, "The question begs to be asked, why not?"

If there was optimism anywhere, it was with the high school students who felt that the present impasse can be overcome and that Canada will remain one country but that there is a pressing urgency to solve the problems immediately.

On behalf of the citizens of St Thomas-Elgin and Allview Cable, it is hoped that this committee's work will lead to a speedy resolution of Canada's present growing pains. We hope that these recorded video images will be part of that healing process. We would like to thank you for taking the time to listen to us.

I hope one of your researchers gets hold of that tape or you can watch it in your hotel rooms or something.

1440

The Chair: Thank you very much, first of all, Mr Rudolfs, to you and to Allview Cable for taking this initiative. I think on behalf of the committee that we appreciate that. The fact that a service like a cable company would take on

this kind of initiative, I think warrants well for all of us. I do not know if there are any questions on anything you have said. We will provide an opportunity for members of the committee to view the tape.

Mr Malkowski: Just a brief question.

The Chair: Sorry, there is a brief question.

Mr Malkowski: I am just wondering, does that video happen to be closed-captioned?

Mr Rudolfs: No, it is not; sorry. We never even thought of that, you know. That is one of those things that bears thinking about certainly, though, if Canada is going to stay together.

Mr Malkowski: Yes, the possibility for future consideration.

LONDON NATIVE RIGHTS SUPPORT GROUP

The Chair: Okay, I understand that the London Native Rights Support Group is now here—Harold Koehler and June MacLaurin, and Dan Smoke, I guess, is also joining them.

Mr Koehler: I would like to first congratulate the commission for its perseverance in its treks across the province. I am sure you are weary with this process, but we beg you to give us your attention.

We are ashamed of the shabby treatment that has been accorded the first nations in Canada. The situation in Ontario is perhaps not as heinous as in some other jurisdictions. Nevertheless we welcome the opportunity to offer some suggestions for according justice to the people of Ontario's first nations.

Because there will be continuing discussions on Canada's Constitution arising from the demise of the Meech Lake accord, we call on the government of Ontario to demand in the strongest possible terms that due recognition be given to the first nations in the Canadian Constitution, and that they be accorded the courtesy and respect which is due to the gracious hosts to the guests who sojourn in their land.

You may wonder what the London Native Rights Support Group is. We are a group of citizens in London who probably, like myself, were very interested in native rights for a number of years, but as a result of the Oka events of 1990 we were inflamed and motivated to get together. We formed an organization in co-operation with the N'Amerind (London) Friendship Centre.

With these events as a mobilizer, we have had a number of meetings and the goals of our group are cross-cultural and educational awareness. With regard to the goal for education, it is to promote in the non-native community better understanding and co-operation with the native peoples. The goal of cross-cultural awareness is to unify the skills and resources of native and non-native people to assist the first nations in their pursuit of self-determination.

Now we know you have heard many submissions about the French and English languages and the condition about Quebec and the condition about the west, but we would like to focus on the native people of America and Canada.

The 20th century has a long and bitter history of annexation. Japan in Manchuria in 1932, Germany in the Saarland in 1935, Italy in Ethiopia in 1936, Germany in Austria in March 1938, Germany in Czechoslovakia in September 1938, the USSR in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in 1940, China in Tibet in 1959, the USA in South Vietnam in 1965, Israel in Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt in 1967, Indonesia in East Timor in 1975, the USSR in Afghanistan in 1979 and Iraq in Kuwait in 1990.

These are all considered to be international crimes and only in the last has the United Nations decided to evict the aggressor, and George Bush, the President of the United States, is the hero of the piece.

Should we cast our glance back five centuries we would find that annexation was the most popular European parlour sport. This annexation was not limited to tiny states but extended to subcontinents and even many continents. There was no League of Nations or United Nations to protest. Divine right of kings ruled and European nations were too busy with their feet in the trough to protest.

Four continents were annexed and the invaders have not been driven out to this day. In most cases the aboriginal peoples were subjected to atrocities of various dimensions. Other escapades have resulted in inestimable human suffering in China, India, Indochina, the Philippines, Palestine, many parts of Africa and perhaps worst of all in South Africa. While the hero of the Gulf war chastises Saddam Hussein for his intransigence and brutality, the western movies glorify the massacre of the first nations. Meanwhile America's aboriginal people suffer under the yoke from Cape Horn to James Bay and Alaska, and everywhere in between.

We regret the injustices of the past. We cite them only in some way to explain our indignation. It is impudent to demand that the Europeans get out of America and leave the administration of those beautiful lands to the first nations who lived here in an unpolluted Garden of Eden until they were civilized and assimilated. It is time that the annexing nations repent and begin to pay the reparations. Our rent is due and we would like to offer some constructive suggestions to pay the bill.

Recommendation: "Two founding nations" is inappropriate language for Canada's Constitution. Use instead "first nations, French and English."

Recommendation: The first nations should be fully involved in the process of revising the Constitution, and fully consulted and involved in any programs which affect native peoples.

With regard to sovereignty and self-government, the first nations inhabited America for thousands of years before the Europeans came to these shores. These nations maintained their government without aid and hence were sovereign and self-governing.

The first legislation I have any record of was the royal proclamation of 1763. Bruce Clark, in his book, quotes:

"The right of a race to govern itself is bound up with the territory over which they have control. Historically that territory was identified as a residual category of land, being, 'such parts of our dominions and territories as, not having been ceded to them or purchased by us, are reserved

to them, or any of them, as their hunting grounds.' The proclamation further enacted that the natives 'should not be molested or disturbed' upon 'their hunting grounds,' until they sold 'their' lands to the crown."

That was the legislation. That is what the King said in 1763. I am not sure what jurisdiction the King had to deal with the lands of America, but at least these proclamations were made to guide his governors and the governments that had been set up in what we now know as Canada.

In the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, section 25:

"The guarantee in this charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal people of Canada including (a) any rights or freedoms that have been" proclaimed "by the royal proclamation of October 7, 1763; and (b) any rights or freedoms that may be acquired by the aboriginal peoples of Canada by way of land claims settlement."

Also in the Constitution Act, section 35:

"Rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada:

"(1) The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed."

We have a clear statement from the earliest acts of the British in the northern part of North America pertaining to the rights and freedoms of the native people.

It is indeed unfortunate that the existence of legislation does not of itself ensure that justice will be done. If unclear language is used for political reasons to ensure its adoption, so that vested interests will have leverage to exploit and control, justice is not done. Administration by incompetent or corrupt officials is regrettable, and should be punished and adjusted. Unwise policies of assimilation and enfranchisement have not served our first nations well and should be discontinued. It may be true that such miscarriage of justice can be righted by the courts, but the lack of funds to pay legal fees makes this road unacceptable to first nations. Their unfamiliarity with English ways and laws are a further hazard. We are quick to charge other administrations with running kangaroo courts and we should be wary that our jurisprudence does not fall into that category."

1450

Recommendation: The Constitution of Canada should be written in clear language without dependence on complex references or legal precedents to give the first nations their sovereign rights and the self-government with which they were privileged at the time of annexation; that is, in 1492.

Recommendation: Competent legal assistance should be made available as a matter of right to native peoples whenever governments, corporations or individuals oppress them. The rule of innocence until guilt is proven should be extended to the provision of legal assistance for the protection of that innocence.

Recommendation: The federal government should increase the responsibility and autonomy of native nations to full sovereignty so that the incentives for economic development and efficient fiscal management may be realized.

The responsibility for making equalization payments in exchange for the privilege of Canada sharing the use of these lands and resources of the first nations should be acknowledged and implemented.

Native nations were sought out as military allies early in our history and they supported the British cause in the American War of Independence and in the War of 1812. European scourges of smallpox, firearms, alcohol, industrialization, commercialization, pollution and depletion of resources have weighed heavily on the native peoples. They are fighting back on all fronts. The present condition is proof that our ways have not worked. We call on you to get used to doing things their way. A reversal of roles is long overdue.

Much has been said recently in the present international struggles about human rights. The preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights includes, "Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law."

Further at article 17: "No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."

Article 23(1): "Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment."

Recommendation: Since some of the cited articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have not been extended to Canada's native people, either now or in the past, we recommend that in future these rights as well as others covered by the declaration be fully accorded to the native people in Canada.

I would now like to introduce June MacLaurin who will continue our presentation.

Ms MacLaurin: Thank you, Harold. I am going to be covering education next.

Band-operated schools which represent an educational system run by aboriginal people seem to serve aboriginal children better. Where aboriginal people have been able to assume responsibility for the education of their children, the results are positive with higher attendance levels, increased high school graduates and success rates.

The public school system still tries to socialize aboriginal students into believing that in order to succeed in this world Indian students have to surrender their Indianness, that their culture is an interesting historical curiosity but has little vitality and no relevance in today's world.

The lack of appropriate aboriginal educational materials in public school systems in Canada has resulted in an appalling level of ignorance on the part of non-aboriginal people about the past and current state of affairs of aboriginal people in Canada. Ignorance leads to misunderstanding which in turn leads almost inevitably to intolerance, prejudice and racism.

For aboriginal students to succeed and become full members of society, they must have an identity firmly anchored in the cultural world of their own people, while at the same time gaining the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in the larger one.

There are three recommendations here that we make.

Recommendation: Ensure the right of native nations to establish and control their own schools and educational programs.

Recommendation: Develop and provide educational materials that accurately depict aboriginal culture, history and reality. Educators must demand such materials and require that they be used in both native and public schools, instead of having the same old history books tell us about—they do not go into the beautiful native culture that is there. It is the same thing, I guess, with the black culture. There has to be more input into the schools about native history.

Recommendation—which I think is really a good one: Promote a program on native issues in your universities and community colleges in many disciplines including education, anthropology, economics, health, sociology, law, religion and especially environmental studies, as we all know native people have the very land base and closeness to the earth and they could teach us a lot about how to help with the environment.

The second part I am going to deal with is health care. Health and social service programs for native nations are more effective if provided and administered by native people. The importance of health care is apparent from the poor health of native peoples. The high death rates, infant mortality and rates of admission to hospitals are indicative of this need.

Recommendation: Native nations should have the right to design and administer their own health and social service programs. Traditional native healers should be encouraged to work together with western medicine where they are appropriate and effective, and native nations could subcontract out to hospitals. Native people really do have a wonderful holistic approach to medicine and they could definitely benefit by using this with their own people.

The third part I am going to deal with is short. It is official languages. Although much has been said about the availability of English and French, it is just as frustrating for native people to attempt to make their needs known in a language which is not their own. There are over 50 native languages in Canada and a solution is not easy. They say only three of them will probably survive: Cree, Inuit and Ojibway. This is perhaps one of the most cogent reasons for providing for self-government for the native nations. In that way most of the regulations with government can be conducted in the local language.

Recommendation: Selected items of government information should be made available in native languages of Cree, Inuit and Ojibway.

Recommendation: Policing and administration of justice should be a responsibility of native nations with the possible exception of trials for the most severe offences.

I am next going to pass it over to Dan Smoke.

Mr Smoke: Good afternoon.

[Remarks in native language]

I am Snipe Clan, Seneca Nation, First Nation, Six Nations Grand River, presently living here in London. I am going to be talking on spirituality and culture and I will be talking to hunting and fishing rights and Ontario initiatives.

Spirituality and culture: From sea to sea the nations of the aboriginal peoples have a heritage of kinship with the Creator, a respect for the Mother Earth who gives them life, food and shelter. Their prophets include the Peacemaker who brought the Five Nations together in peace and harmony. He gave them the great law of peace which includes 114 Wampums, which means it must exceed the 10 Commandments in length because it includes not only a moral code but also a code for the internal self government of the nation and for peaceful inter-nation negotiations.

Just as the land is expansive, so the customs and traditions are varied. The Great Spirit has many forms based on the teachings that are passed down by the elders from generation to generation. These depend on the very needs for food and shelter from the frozen north to the mountain valleys to the great plains, the forests and the sea coasts, and revelation has not yet ceased.

The eagle feather, a symbol of honour to note the communion with the Great Spirit for ages came into the ken of the nation with TV coverage of the demise of Meech Lake in the Manitoba Legislature when Elijah Harper held it during his historical no.

1500

The native spirituality way is the tradition of brotherhood, community, peace with mankind, yea, even with the European explorers, and peace with the environment. That is the native way: not the message of a savage, but the message of a saviour. Shame on the errors of your forefathers who outlawed the native spiritual practices, banned the powwow and the potlatch, while at the same time they stole their land, their livelihood and their self-esteem. Culture is not static. It does not stop growing simply because it encounters another culture. It grows and adapts itself to the changing environment.

We are unable in this scenario to give full credit to the warmth and power of the native spirituality. The poems, stories and documentaries in *The Phoenix*, which you have before you, give a better sample. Better still, obtain a videotape of *Drums* or *The Spirit Within*, and view them. The story, the song, the music, the spiritual message and the determination to overcome the social obstacles that confront our first nations are powerfully portrayed.

Hunting and fishing rights: Since many aboriginal people obtain their livelihood from hunting and fishing, it is essential that their right to do so be continued. Rivers and lakes need to be protected from mining and industrial pollutants so that the fish will be edible without harming the health of those who live off of them. The habitat of the animals must not be destroyed by deforestation or flooding by hydroelectric projects. Tourist operations which tend to deplete the stocks of fish and game must be carefully monitored to ensure that the benefits of the tourist trade to the native peoples outweigh the damage.

Recommendation: The right of aboriginal people to hunt, fish, trap and harvest without interference must be protected. Regulations to prevent unacceptable depletion must be under the control of the first nations affected, by the administration vehicles of their self-government.

Ontario initiatives: It may be a long time before we see new constitutional improvements. Ontario is to be

congratulated on the conclusion of joint native, provincial and federal agreements in southeastern Ontario. We would encourage Ontario to give high priority to the negotiation of arrangements like this or like what the governments have with Sechelt, the Cree-Naskapi models and Ontario's first nations.

Mr Koehler to my right, one of the members of our committee, met with Gordon Peters of the Chiefs of Ontario on 15 January 1981 regarding possible provincial initiatives. Chief Peters indicated that the native nations are ready and, as a concrete witness, he supplied copies of a protocol ratified by the Ontario chiefs in assembly as follows:

Adoption of statement of relationship. Statement of relationship: Principles to guide discussions between the first nations in Ontario and the Crown in right of Ontario, 1990. These documents are appended for your information.

The first nations council report to the 16th annual all-Ontario chiefs' conference, held 23-27 July 1990, contains aspirations and recommendations on nationhood, language, leadership, traditional territories, community development and internal and external relationships.

The Six Nations elders tell a story that underlies the background of the treaty represented by the two-row wampum. It is a string of two rows of equal beads, running side by side like two vessels travelling together down the river of life. One of the strings represents the European culture, the other the Iroquois culture. The two-row wampum is endless, meaning that new beads can be woven on, representing new generations that will live together in harmony. The treaty intended that the two cultures be respected and honoured, each in its own way, without assimilation. Anyone trying to straddle the two ways of life, that is, one foot on each vessel, will fall into the river. The assimilation policy of the federal Department of Indian affairs has resulted in our native brothers and sisters being lost between these two vessels.

Epilogue: The existence of your commission attests to the wide diversity in opinions in Canada: French and English, urban and rural, east and west. The first nations in Canada similarly have a wide range of views, and to deal with them will require patience and perseverance. We ask you not to despair. With faith, hope and charity and a modicum of the brotherhood and desire for peace espoused by the Iroquois great law of peace, we are convinced that a new renaissance dawns.

Thank you. Any questions?

The Chair: Thank you very much. We actually are beyond the time that we had allocated, so we are not going to be able to deal with questions. But I do appreciate, and I think I speak on behalf of the committee, the presentation you have given us, an extensive array of concerns that we need to address. I thank you for the detail to which you have gone in providing us with some of these suggestions.

PAULINE FAUBERT-McCABE

The Chair: Next is Pauline McCabe. Come forward, please. If you would just give these to the clerk, we will get them distributed while you are speaking to us. Go ahead.

Mrs Faubert-McCabe: Bonjour, mesdames et messieurs et membres du comité consultatif.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen and members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. My name is Pauline Faubert-McCabe. I am the wife of Philip McCabe, mother of Benjamin, Nicholas and Rory McCabe, and a French consultant with the London and Middlesex County Roman Catholic School Board.

I wish to thank the members of this committee for the opportunity to present my point of view on issues that have affected me as a Canadian citizen and that will no doubt further impact on me and my family in the very near future.

The events of this past summer marked me in a very disturbing way. The failure of the Meech Lake accord left me feeling betrayed by my leaders and the subsequent events at Oka in Quebec left me feeling ashamed. Now the province of Quebec is issuing an ultimatum: either we agree to its wish list or it will set out to leave Confederation.

What has happened to us as a people, that we should act in such a self-centred way? I view my country as I view my family. The federal government, my parents, has the responsibility of seeing that certain values and principles are maintained and that the provinces, like children, have to accept that we as a family have common goals. Just as in a family we cannot be focusing entirely on individual needs, so will the provinces have to accept that compromises will be necessary to ensure the collective good. The federal government has to set the tone and clearly articulate those things that we value and accept as Canadians. It must identify those elements that we as a people and a nation stand for in Confederation.

1510

Examples of these principles might include: that consideration be given to the needs of all Canadians from British Columbia to Newfoundland, to the Yukon, to Quebec; that bilingualism is a cornerstone of our society and it must continue to be supported; that our system of social programs remain intact; that such traditions as the monarchy be relegated to our past and that we concentrate on celebrating Canada in the future; that the aboriginal people be invited to participate more fully in our country and take on a more positive and active role as Canadians; that Quebec stop looking to the rest of Canada to understand it and begin by trying to appreciate where the rest of Canada is coming from; that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms be accepted by all Canadians as the law of the land.

Who will be our hero or heroine? Who will inspire us to focus less on individual rights and more on our obligations? Who will be able to speak to and for the whole country? Who will have the courage to use tough love with Quebec and not be held for ransom? Who will help Quebec see the rest of Canada's point of view? Who will have the honour of protecting Quebec's linguistic and cultural heritage? Who will draw us together again as one? Who will sincerely commit to leading our Canadian family?

Perhaps the time has come to look for the hero in all of us. We as Canadians have remained complacent for too long. Ontario, because of its close ties with Quebec, is best positioned to take the lead. Historically, geographically

and economically we have enjoyed a close relationship with Quebec. Because of this advantage Ontario must now relate Quebec's needs to the rest of Canada. Ontario must also devote time to developing a stronger, more positive relationship with the western and eastern provinces. We have recently overlooked their concerns. They too feel isolated and misunderstood. They too are speaking of separation.

Ontario must review with all parties those values that we stand for as Canadians. If necessary, Ontario may have to go the extra mile and declare our province bilingual, but having done that, Quebec has to understand that enough is enough. They must not be allowed to put their provincial needs before the country's collective needs. They must not be allowed to dictate their needs at our expense. We are in this together and, if necessary, strong measures must be used to remind Quebecers of their responsibilities to their fellow Canadians. Quebec must never think that for one moment we would ever allow them to leave. Separation is simply not an acceptable alternative.

D'après la légende, mes ancêtres ont quitté la France au dix-septième siècle pour le Canada à la recherche d'une meilleure vie. Arrivés au Québec, ils cherchèrent des terres fertiles. Malheureusement, les belles terres étaient déjà prises. Découragés, ils rencontrèrent le père Bréboeuf qui les invita à le suivre jusqu'au Grands Lacs et encore un peu plus au sud vers la région de Chatham, le long de la rivière Thames. Mes ancêtres ont passé leur premier hiver parmi les autochtones déjà établis là. Au printemps, ces premiers pionniers français se sont oeuvrés à la tâche d'établir une petite communauté française qui serait reconnue plus tard sous le nom de Paincourt. Aujourd'hui, la paroisse de Paincourt existe toujours. Mon père et mes frères travaillent toujours sur la terre.

How is it that such a small French community has managed to survive after so many years in southwestern Ontario and maintain its linguistic and cultural identity? I believe that reason prevailed long ago, just as it will today. The two groups restated those basic principles that made them different, yet the same. Out of respect and a sense of fairness it was determined that each would maintain its identity and work together in harmony. Today the community continues to flourish. Can we not as a country learn something here?

C'est le temps d'agir ; carpe diem. Let us seize the day, for we are rich and resourceful as a people and a nation. Thank you. Merci.

The Chair: Merci à vous, Madame. Are there questions of the speaker? All I have to do is ask. Mr Offer.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much and thank you for your presentation. You have spoken about the need to build a relationship, a spirit, a harmony, between Ontario and Quebec, and that in itself may be the link or the bridge to keep the country together. Recognizing that there are currently discussions going on between Quebec and the federal government, I am wondering whether you feel—and it was not in the presentation—that there is the latitude within this province and in the rest of the country to redefine the federalism of the country, to redefine some of the roles

and the responsibilities between the federal and the provincial governments.

Mrs Faubert-McCabe: Could you give me an example? I am not sure I quite understand.

Mr Offer: I will give you an example. Basically there are certain responsibilities which are provincial in nature, others which are federal. Right now there is discussion between Quebec and Ottawa that says that the province of Quebec should have a larger responsibility, deal with some of those powers provincially which are now federal. Do you see that as something which we in Ontario should be looking at, to accommodate some of the needs and desires of Quebec or something else? How else do we help bridge Ontario to Quebec and the rest of the provinces?

Mrs Faubert-McCabe: I guess I feel that Ontario and Quebec are very favoured in that they have already established many of these bridges in a very strong relationship. Upon reflecting a little bit, and I have to concede that I am not totally familiar with the division of powers between federal and provincial, it occurred to me that elements that would have to do with culture, with education, should really be given completely to the provinces so that they can fully maintain their identity and their outlook, whereas certain things that would pertain specifically to all Canadians, such as a health care system, I firmly believe should remain more in the hands of the federal government.

I feel that as Ontarians we really should assume more of a leadership role in trying to pull everyone together. We are situated very favourably to do that and we have been working very hard, I feel, with Quebec to bring about an understanding. But there are other people in this country, other provinces that perhaps might take offence to our being so preoccupied at times with Quebec. Quebec is obviously the squeaky wheel right now and it is getting a lot of attention, and rightly so in some ways, but I have to feel that we must not forget about the other provinces. I think we have to bring them on line as well, to try to appreciate those things that Quebec values and feels very strongly about, yet at the same time Quebec must appreciate those things that we as Canadians value and are not prepared to compromise either.

I really feel that as Ontarians perhaps we can be Quebec's spokesperson. If nothing else, they have a good ally in us that way. On the other hand, they must really stop this extremely aggressive rhetoric and this constant ultimatum-setting they are always doing. They are in this with us. We started out together. We are going to finish that way, I hope. We just have to make them as well appreciate where we are coming from.

1520

The Chair: Thank you very much. We will end there.

Mrs Faubert-McCabe: Did you have a question?

The Chair: They did, but we are not going to be able to carry on with all their questions, otherwise we will not get through all the speakers.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
SOCIETY OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

The Chair: Could I invite next from the University of Western Ontario Society of Graduate Students, Astrid Heyer.

Ms Heyer: Bonjour mesdames, messieurs, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Astrid Heyer. I would like to like to talk to you about international student issues and their relevance to the Confederation question. The international student issue is a multi-faceted one and this brief presentation will focus on the need for a national policy for international students.

I myself am an international graduate student at the University of Western Ontario. My country of origin is West Germany, where I studied French and English at the Free University of West Berlin. I am currently pursuing a doctoral degree in French in London, and this year I am also serving as the president of the society of graduate students.

When I was invited to appear before your committee the question arose: In what way are international students linked to questions of Confederation? In 1981 I had the opportunity to spend a year as an exchange student at Laval University in Quebec City. Immersing myself in Canadian culture, I read Hugh MacLennan's *Two Solitudes*, a title which more than ever today seems to reflect Canada's dilemma.

In a way, international students are also caught between two solitudes, which are, however, neither cultural nor linguistic. I am talking about two other solitudes, the federal and provincial governments. Let me explain. Policy towards the education of international students involves a typically Canadian predicament: Constitutional responsibility for education lies in the hands of provincial governments; foreign aid, as well as employment and immigration, are federal functions. This is very confusing for international students as they depend on two different jurisdictions.

To the international community, Canada has the reputation of being one country with two official languages being fluently spoken in all parts of the country. I guess I do not have to tell you that the reality is rather different. Once an international student passes the federal requirements to obtain a student visa, he or she will find a peculiar financial arrangement that differs from one province to another. Seven out of 10 provinces charge differential tuition fees and these differ quite dramatically from province to province.

Before I give you some background on the history of differential fees, there is the legitimate question of why Canada should strive to educate international students. Do we really need them or does Canada really need them? Among those who have researched the issues are the Ontario Federation of Students, the Canadian Federation of Students, the Canadian Bureau for International Education, only to name a few. Among these groups there is no doubt that Canada benefits enormously, both inside and outside the educational community, through the presence of visa students at all levels of education. Though many of these benefits are of a long-term or intangible nature, it is clear that international students are valuable educational, political

and economic resources for Canada. By the same token, the approximately 20,000 Canadians studying abroad increase the international status of Canada in political, cultural, educational and economic terms.

Visa students must be regarded as an integral part of any balanced system of education. Fostering international exchange is essential for maintaining Canada's role in the research and development of the global marketplace. According to the Ontario Federation of Students, Canada cannot afford to project a climate of educational protectionism at a time when the world is becoming increasingly interdependent. In the area of post-secondary education there should be nothing more irrelevant than national boundaries, especially when the right mix of domestic and visa students is essential for maintaining the integrity and standards of Canada's post-secondary education system. As a country, as a Confederation, Canada must examine the issues affecting international students within the context of foreign policy concerns as well as the long-term development of education policy. In my opinion the provincial and federal governments must co-operate in forming a long-term national policy on international students in Canada.

If we quickly look at the development of enrolment of international students, you will notice that during the last decade there was a dramatic decline in numbers. Going back to the late 1950s and mid-1960s the growth in post-secondary institutions was based on the notion that the Canadian and Ontario governments as well as the general public supported the philosophy of increased accessibility to higher education. The ideal was that all academically qualified students should have the right to post-secondary education. Canadians as well as visa students wishing to study in Canada did in fact benefit from this expansion. Until the mid-1960s there were more Canadians who studied and received degrees abroad than visa students in Canada. However, by the late 1960s Canada became a net beneficiary of the international exchange in post-secondary education. This upward trend continued throughout the 1970s, and then, as you may well remember, in the late 1970s differential fees were introduced by the provincial governments. In Ontario, even with the introduction of differential fees in 1977 for universities, the visa student enrolment continued to climb, reaching the highwater mark of 18,747 students in 1982-83.

However, and I will quote from a study done by the OFS research department:

"In the early 1980s, Canada experienced a precipitous 23% drop in the number of international students at the post-secondary level, with the most dramatic decrease of 18% occurring at the university level. Ontario, the largest net importer of visa students, with its massive 40% increase in differential fees in 1982-83, experienced the most dramatic decline in visa student enrolment. At the same time those provinces which have refrained from charging differential fees"—and those are Manitoba and Newfoundland and Saskatchewan—"registered significant increases in visa student enrolment between 1983-85. Ontario's differential fee increase was imposed at a time when Canada was experiencing an economic recession"—and many international students fear right now that another big increase may

come our way—"and the user-pay philosophy for post-secondary education had gained considerable support from many sectors of the population. Canada's post-secondary institutions were losing the essential services battle, and within this context visa students became an easy scapegoat."

For every year between 1983-84 and 1987-88, total international student enrolment in Canada declined each year. This decline has been most marked in undergraduate university enrolment. It appears that this very disturbing trend has been halted in 1988-89, although there was still significant concern about the levels of international student enrolment in Canada. There is a continuing need to focus attention on the numbers of international students here, because despite the increase in 1989, there are now 40% fewer international students at the undergraduate level than there were 10 years ago. This means that international students now make up only 3.2% of the total Canadian undergraduate population, the lowest level ever. Similarly at the graduate level, master's enrolment levels are only now returning to levels which existed in the early 1970s.

1530

Although it is difficult to attribute the downward trend in visa student enrolment exclusively to escalating differential fees, statistics clearly indicate that such fees are the largest contributing factor. At present, international students have to pay anywhere from 1.5 to 13 times the tuition that domestic students pay. I can give you an example. Until May 1989 the University of Western Ontario here in London charged differential fees for a full-time international student amounting to \$9,168 compared to \$1,793 a Canadian student has to pay.

In May of that year, the university announced for the first time a widely appreciated discount for the third-term fee, which is now reduced to \$1,300. This, however—it should be noted—only applies to international graduate students, not to students in undergraduate programs.

One positive step was taken in Ontario to stop the decline of international students. In 1987 the Ministry of Colleges and Universities provided \$5 million province-wide to waive differential tuition fees for 1,000 highly qualified graduate students. That means these students now pay the same amount as Canadians. At the University of Western Ontario, among the 321 currently enrolled international graduate students, 100 were chosen to receive the fee waiver.

Related to the differential fee issue is the lack of a coherent policy at the federal and provincial levels on international students. The result of such a—let's call it—policy vacuum is, for example, the wide variance of differential fees charged in the different provinces. With regard to Canadian and provincial policies on visa students, they can be described at best as ambivalent. The Canadian Council of Ministers of Education stated in 1986 that the lack of a coherent policy is confusing "and harmful to foreign students, wasteful of resources and ultimately detrimental to Canada."

Unfortunately, yes, on the international scale Canada fares rather poorly. In a 1989 report which analyses levels of support for international students in France, Germany, Britain, Australia, Japan and Canada, Canada ranks last in

terms of support for international education. France, at the top, charges international students the equivalent of only \$90 and spends approximately \$1.4 billion each year. Germany does not charge tuition fees at all and spends \$630 million. In comparison, Canada spends \$60 million.

The Chair: Ms Heyer, could you sum up? We are getting towards the end of the time.

Ms Heyer: Clearly this absence of an active long-term national policy on visa students has opened the doors to the levying of excessive differential fees at the provincial level. Visa student policies seem to be contingent year in and year out on the various funding situations facing Canada's provincially run post-secondary institutions. Provincial governments have complained for years, and I think this government will be no exception, that they are not receiving sufficient funds from Ottawa to pay for the costs of educating visa students, forcing them in effect to charge differential fees. International students are being caught between Ottawa and the provinces and the result of this catch-22 is that very many international students go to other countries rather than Canada to pursue their education.

I would like, to briefly sum up, to ask this government to try to come to an arrangement with the federal government to develop this national policy and also make sure you have international accessibility so that you get academically qualified students and not financially attractive ones. International students often feel they do not have the right to voice their concerns. They are very shy and they are also very grateful to be here and have the opportunity to study in this country.

Just on a personal note, I would like to add that I hope you will be successful in your efforts to maintain and create a Canada which could have a model character for the rest of the world in which values such as tolerance, co-existence and acceptance can be realized. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Heyer. We are going to move on, given the number of speakers we still have to hear from.

On that note, I want to say we have less than an hour left because we need to vacate these premises for other events and also because we need to move to our next location in Kitchener. We have five, possibly six, presentations still to go. Quite frankly, the only way we are going to accommodate those is with a combination of no questions or very short questions, and also, from the presenters, very short presentations. We will go through a few more and see if we need to go to our last-resort measure of maximum times. We may have to do that.

FEMMES DU SUD DE L'ONTARIO, SECTION DU COMITÉ DE MIDDLESEX ET LONDON

The Chair: Could I call next Pauline Cousineau of Femmes du Sud de l'Ontario, section du comité de Middlesex et London.

Mme Cousineau : Messieurs, mesdames, au nom du comité de London, du réseau des Femmes du Sud de l'Ontario, nous voulons remercier le comité Silipo de nous avoir donné l'occasion d'ajouter nos commentaires sur le sujet du rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

Le réseau a pour but d'établir une liste de personnel francophone travaillant pour des agences sociocommunautaires pour aider les femmes qui sont victimes de la violence familiale. Un autre objectif est de faire des démarches auprès des conseils scolaires catholique et public afin de vérifier l'existence de programmes préventifs pour nos enfants. Étant un nouveau groupe dans la région de London, nous sommes déçus du manque de services offerts dans les deux langues officielles du Canada. Nos appels à beaucoup d'agences dont la femme qui est victime de violence a besoin nous ont aidées à découvrir qu'il n'y avait presque personne pour nous parler en français. Lorsqu'une personne francophone est prise d'une crise, c'est très difficile de s'exprimer en sa langue et presque impossible en anglais.

Comme membres du comité, nous croyons que l'Ontario devrait devenir une province bilingue afin de pouvoir offrir tous ses services en français et en anglais. Les francophones de London ne demeurent pas dans une ville déclarée bilingue, alors nous n'avons pas la chance de faire nos entreprises commerciales en français. Ce sont nos droits comme citoyens fondateurs du Canada de recevoir ces services en français.

À London, nous demandons le pouvoir de nous réunir dans un centre où l'on peut jaser en français, où l'on peut se sentir chez soi, où l'on peut être reconnu comme un organisme qui existe et non seulement comme un numéro de téléphone. Lorsque nous regardons London, on s'aperçoit que cette ville représente le Canada sans la province du Québec. Les francophones sont répandus à travers la ville, n'ayant aucune concentration dans un quartier, alors nous n'avons pas de centre où l'on peut se réunir pour développer notre sens de communauté. Nous sommes comme un peuple sans pays. Nous avons des droits, mais depuis longtemps nous n'osons pas les demander à cause de peur d'affronter les Anglais. Nous ne voulons pas perdre notre identité francophone, alors depuis une dizaine d'années nous luttons pour être reconnues comme des personnes qui ont autant de droits que les communautés anglophone et autochtones.

C'est avec plus d'éducation de nos jeunes gens, avec plus de réunions et d'ateliers que nous pouvons continuer à lutter pour nos droits, pour notre héritage. Nous savons que la plupart des environnements de travail ont comme langue officielle l'anglais. Mais si beaucoup plus de personnes hors du Québec sont encouragées à parler français, peut-être que bientôt le français deviendrait aussi utilisé que l'anglais.

En conclusion, nous voulons vous demander de continuer à travailler avec le reste du Canada afin que le Québec ne se sépare pas. Le Canada est rendu à une époque très sensible. Il faut se rappeler que la richesse qu'offre le Québec est immense, non seulement monétairement mais aussi en talents. En gardant le Québec dans la Confédération, nous pouvons demeurer un pays uni devant les autres pays. Nous devons continuer à bâtir notre pays dont nous sommes très fiers. Merci.

DARLENE CLICHE-PARKER

The Chair: Darlene Cliche-Parker.

Ms Cliche-Parker: For those of you who would like to put your translating devices on, my preamble is in French.

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, mesdames et messieurs, je tiens premièrement à vous remercier de cette occasion de venir me prononcer sur l'avenir de mon pays, de ma province et celui de mon peuple. J'avais le choix entre la commission Silipo, la commission Spicer ou la commission Tréva Cousineau. Je comprends très bien l'importance de mes paroles et j'ai choisi de me prononcer devant cette commission avec des députés élus et non nommés, puisque tous et chacun ont une influence sur les autres députés et le pouvoir d'exécuter des changements à la loi.

Vous êtes un nouveau gouvernement qui s'est déjà prononcé dans plusieurs domaines, très favorablement, si je peux faire le commentaire. Je n'ai cependant pas de discours à donner aux francophones car c'est prêcher aux convertis. Je dois vous informer que la minorité linguistique, qu'elle soit francophone et située en Ontario ou au Saskatchewan, qu'elle soit anglophone et vit au lac Saint-Jean ou dans la ville de Montréal, ses membres se comprennent très bien entre eux et c'est exactement ce qu'il leur faut pour assurer leur survie. Alors, comme l'autochtone fait son discours dans la langue de la majorité pour que rien ne se perde dans la traduction, je vais faire la même chose, puisque c'est à la majorité anglophone que je vais adresser ces paroles.

1540

I am Darlene Cliche-Parker, a 13th-generation Canadian of Irish and French heritage and a francophone. I am a former president of the Association française de London. I was the spokesperson for the French-speaking ratepayers in this city with regard to the first public French-language school, and Dianne Cunningham can attest to this. I was a member of the committee to establish the first French separate elementary school. When it came time to make the legal request for the first French secondary school, I was the spokesperson. I was chair of the French-language advisory committee at the London Board of Education and have also been involved with the community at large and with my co-workers in my workplace, having been involved with my union.

What is Ontario's role in Confederation? What are the values that we share? What are the roles of our federal and provincial governments? How do French and English play a part in Canada? How can Ontario improve its contribution to the economy? These are questions I am going to address.

We have to look at our country in its reality, look at the makeup of the province and see how we can improve our way of life and our contribution to the society in which we live. The multicultural aspect of Canada is not one to be questioned. This is a fact that we must accept as reality. Each culture brings to the country a richness that cannot be found elsewhere, and our policy of multiculturalism demonstrates that we as Canadians appreciate that diversity. It

may also help to offset the blandness and conservatism of which we Canadians are so often accused. This ethnic diversity is absorbed into either of our two official language groups, depending on which province it chooses to live in.

I have, however, become very concerned with the events which have taken place at these hearings with speakers trying to demolish the liberties we enjoy as Canadians, instead of elaborating on improvements we might envisage to our present arrangement. I watch the news at night and feel great anxiety when I hear that many speakers are objecting to the very richness of our country and our province and are proposing a complete reversal of the values upon which our country was built. They seem to have forgotten that without the co-operation of both linguistic groups and the native peoples, our ancestors would not have survived the harshness of this country.

Upper Canada and Lower Canada had a basic understanding that both language groups had a right to coexist and enjoy an equal number of services. As we expanded and increased the number of provinces, the balance of linguistic groups changed and unfortunately so did the thinking of the linguistic majority. As we increased our immigration without ensuring that the new arrivals were sensitized to our unique history and alliance, some of these linguistic rights were crushed.

The survival of the linguistic minority is dependent upon three vital areas: access to education, to media and to social services. We need not dwell on when and how linguistic rights have been legislated out of existence throughout our country, but only on how in recent years positive changes have come about. In 1969 the Official Languages Act came into being, giving Canadians the right to be served in the official language of their choice in federal government offices from coast to coast.

In Ontario in 1969 we gained the right to secondary school education in French. This enabled communities throughout Ontario to approach their local school boards to implore them to enable our children to continue their education in their mother tongue. In some areas this was very difficult to achieve, and in southwestern Ontario one community waited 10 years until the provincial government finally intervened.

The area of community development which I chose to involve myself with is education, because I feel it is the cornerstone of our survival. We are presently looking at the feasibility of a secondary French-language community school. However, to enable French-speaking Ontarians to fully contribute to the maximum of their potential, one must look at the necessity of the establishment of French-language community colleges and a French university, with perhaps satellite campuses throughout the province. One cannot expect a French-speaking person to be a fully participating member of our Ontario society when French post-secondary education is not available.

In addition, to ensure harmony and prevent confrontations, when the needs of the community are not understood by the English-speaking majority, the whole decision-making process must be put under the control of French-speaking ratepayers through the establishment of French-language

school boards. This is a right the English-speaking minority in Quebec enjoys. Is it too much to ask?

The largest source of information and entertainment today is television. We in London petitioned for the French TV channel and were refused until the CRTC imposed Radio-Canada on a majority who, according to the cable company, preferred American television. All we had requested was one channel. Now that we have Radio-Canada Toronto and a portion of TVOntario, we must have been spoiled, because we were equally cut when the CBC cutbacks were announced. It is now more important than ever to expand TVOntario, so that we have our own separate French channel. It would free up the present TVOntario channel for the English-speaking population and provide the linguistic minority in this province with a means to ensure its survival. Is it too much to ask?

I feel I can understand—

The Chair: Ms Cliche-Parker, could you sum up, please? We are—

Ms Cliche-Parker: I timed this at 14.5 minutes exactly.

The Chair: You do not have 14.5 minutes exactly. You have less than 10 minutes, and you have about a minute and a half left. I apologize for that, but it is the only way we are going to give as many people as possible an opportunity to talk to us. We have your written brief and obviously we can get the details that way. So if you would just highlight the remaining points.

Ms Cliche-Parker: I will. I have left a copy with the secretary.

There are two very important paragraphs I want to mention, one to do with federal and provincial jurisdiction and the other—I feel I can understand full well the French-speaking population in Saskatchewan and Alberta, the English-speaking population in Quebec concerned with its demographics and our native people. We all feel threatened and have a desperate need to be in control of own affairs. Of the three groups, the English-speaking minority of Quebec has the most autonomy. There is not one francophone here present who would not sacrifice the right to post signs in French to obtain in exchange the rich cultural climate the English-speaking population in Quebec enjoys: control of its schools, universities, hospitals, social services, magazines, libraries and umpteen TV channels.

1550

Things that you might consider: In view of the fact that the number of women elected to this Ontario government is the maximum ever elected and we have the most women cabinet ministers ever—and this is 1991; we have our daughters and granddaughters to think of—it might be time to think of gender parity. That would mean enlarging our present constituencies so that we end up with the same numbers of elected representatives, but electing the best man and the best woman for the job in each of these constituencies. This might be one way of ensuring that 51% of the population has its representation in Parliament so that family issues such as day care and spousal abuse finally get the attention they deserve.

We can also look at a new division of powers between the federal and provincial governments. If provinces have

total jurisdiction over education and the federal government has control of the National Training Act, provinces might want this power realigned so that its training needs, which differ from province to province, are met. We can still proportionately pay for certain programs through our federal taxes, but the implementation of what has previously been federal jurisdiction might better serve Canadians by being administered by each individual province, regional development, for instance, while the environment would be better served by federal standards.

I am sure that, as members of the provincial Parliament, you have your own opinions on what you might want to change in federal-provincial areas of responsibility. However, I cannot stress enough the necessity of a strong national Constitution or bill of rights that guarantees our rights, male and female, wherever we might choose to live.

Ontario has the opportunity to take a stand for Canada as it should be at these crossroads. At the present time we have only one officially bilingual province and that is New Brunswick. The other nine provinces are unilingual. Quebec has French and the eight other provinces have English. If Ontario makes itself bilingual, it would make 500,000 francophones and their friends delirious. It would also cause some consternation within certain segments of our Ontario society, but let me ask you, who would object to having minority language rights the same in every province?

If Ontario tries to equal or to even catch up to the official language minority rights provided by our neighbour province of Quebec, not only would we be aligning ourselves with our great trading partner, but we would be engendering the feeling of equality between the provinces and their peoples. In addition, it would put Ontario at the forefront of the entrenchment of official language rights throughout the English provinces.

The latest poll from Quebec states that nearly 70% of Quebecers would prefer to remain in Canada—if. If, after the dust has settled, the only place in Canada that the French-speaking population can live and die in French is in Quebec, we have destroyed what could have been a great country. However, if we can foster an openness of spirit and build a country based on equality, we might end up with a much better country than even our forefathers and foremothers would have hoped for. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

My sense from the number of speakers that we have left is that we can probably deal with three more in the time that we have left, again on the understanding that those groups can keep their comments to under 10 minutes each. That would leave about two or three other groups that we may not reach, and that is assuming that everyone who is on this list is here. I do not know if that is the case. Unless I hear otherwise from the committee, I will proceed on that basis.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: I invite Diane Dubois and Marie-Lena Del Sordo.

Mme Dubois : L'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, l'ACFO régionale de London-Sarnia, est heureuse

d'avoir l'occasion de s'exprimer auprès de la commission Silipo sur un sujet tellement important pour toute la population, tant ontarienne que canadienne.

L'ACFO est l'organisme porte-parole de la collectivité franco-ontarienne, et depuis sa fondation en 1910 poursuit avec vigueur sa mission de protection et d'avancement des droits de la minorité de langue française en Ontario.

Nous reconnaissons les efforts du gouvernement de l'Ontario pour que les francophones d'ici se sentent chez eux. Les gouvernements fédéral et provincial, ayant déjà réaffirmé leur engagement à respecter, protéger et promouvoir les minorités de langues officielles ont la responsabilité morale d'assumer le leadership.

Le gouvernement de l'Ontario a joué un rôle de chef de file incontestable dans la réalisation de l'unité canadienne par son appui à l'accord du Lac Meech et à la dualité linguistique. Les francophones en Ontario doivent être reconnus pour leur rôle historique dans cette province. Il y a présentement 500 000 francophones en Ontario, plusieurs étant établis dans cette province depuis plus de 350 années.

C'est ici dans le sud-ouest de la province que fût fondée la première paroisse en Ontario en 1767. La première école en Ontario, établie en 1786, était une école française et catholique. Ici dans la région de London nous avons 8500 francophones environ et ces francophones n'ont pas la même qualité de vie que les anglophones dans la région à plusieurs points de vue : éducation, juridique, santé, civique.

Comment pouvons-nous mieux répondre aux besoins et aux aspirations de nos minorités linguistiques ? La constitution doit reconnaître les communautés autochtones, anglophone et francophone. Le préambule de la Loi 8 sur les services en français cite bien le rôle historique que la langue française a joué en Ontario et la reconnaissance par la constitution comme langue officielle au Canada. Il est donc essentiel de maintenir le bilinguisme au niveau fédéral et l'Ontario devrait déclarer le français comme langue officielle partout et non seulement devant les tribunaux et dans l'éducation. Et pour éviter d'être obligés d'avoir recours aux tribunaux pour faire respecter nos droits, il est essentiel que les textes législatifs soient clairs et précis. Dans ce préambule il est dit aussi que l'Assemblée législative reconnaît la part du patrimoine culturel de la population francophone et désire le sauvegarder pour les générations à venir. Il nous sera presque impossible de sauvegarder quoi que ce soit si la gestion scolaire de la maternelle au niveau universitaire ne nous est pas accordée.

L'éducation est primordiale à la survie des francophones. Pour appuyer ce point vital voici quelques statistiques effrayantes pour tous francophones vivant dans le sud-ouest de l'Ontario ou désirant y venir : 31,2% d'analphabètes chez les francophones comparé à 16,8% chez les anglophones ; et 2 sur 3 francophones dans la région du sud-ouest de l'Ontario perdent leur langue à l'assimilation.

Mme Del Santo : Comment atténuer les tensions entre les francophones et anglophones du Canada? D'abord, par l'information.

Les Anglo-Ontariens ne voient que la Loi 101 qui empêche l'affichage mais ne voient pas tous les avantages dont jouit la communauté anglophone au Québec, qui est la minorité ayant le plus de droits dans tout le Canada. Il

est urgent d'unir nos efforts pour dénoncer les propos haineux véhiculés par les groupes antifrancophones, tels que l'APEC. Les Ontariens ne réalisent pas que le bilinguisme ne veut pas dire que l'autre groupe doit apprendre l'autre langue officielle, mais c'est plutôt le moyen pour garantir l'épanouissement personnel des membres de la minorité quelle qu'elle soit.

Le succès évident des écoles d'immersion en Ontario démontre l'intérêt et la volonté d'apprendre l'autre langue. Il faut faire comprendre aux anglophones que les francophones hors Québec ne sont pas des Québécois et n'ont aucune intention de déménager au Québec.

Nous regrettons l'échec du Lac Meech, qui aurait permis au Québec de se joindre à la constitution canadienne. Nous suivons attentivement la situation politique dans le pays car nous craignons pour notre avenir. Quoiqu'il adienne au Québec et dans le reste du pays, nous espérons que nos droits acquis seront respectés par le gouvernement de l'Ontario. Un autre moyen aussi d'atténuer les tensions entre les francophones et les anglophones — je pense que chacun d'entre vous a un répertoire communautaire de la ville de London ; il n'y a pas un seul organisme franco-phone communautaire social cité dans ce répertoire.

C'est juste pour dire que l'unité du Canada commence chez nous et la volonté politique doit être là pour reconnaître le bilinguisme.

1600

M. le Président : Merci pour votre présentation.

Could I invite next—

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Chairman, could I just for the record? I want to say something about this. It is a community directory. It was put together by students from all the secondary schools and the University of Western Ontario. It has been out for three years. The very front of it says, "If there is anyone that has been omitted." It started out as a very small booklet and now it is growing, so I would invite you to call my office immediately. We have no other way, with the resources that were provided, to get people to put their names in that book.

If you find out that there are very few services, which I think you will, then I think you should come to my office and we can talk about it. That is the only way we can make more, at least from my job, in my position. So the others probably have not seen the book. Some people like it. Most people in north London like it very much, but I should advise you that right now there is a great degree of concern about even that book, written in English. They think it is a waste of money and it comes to my office.

I do not put out a newsletter. I try to put out things that are useful to the community, and all of us as elected people are facing the same criticism, even today, as we give a lot of our time and effort and are sincerely trying to find a solution to the problems. We are all in the same boat. We feel the same way you do about where you start. But we will start with that one, if you will get in touch with me. Do not go away without telling me or I cannot fix it.

Ms Del Santo: Sure, we will. Thank you.

LONDON AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL

The Chair: Can I invite next Gil Warren from the London and District Labour Council.

Mr Warren: I have some copies of my presentation which I would be happy to give to the MPPs. I was prepared to do a 20-minute presentation, so I will shorten it down to about seven minutes and see how we can do.

Just in terms of background, I am speaking on behalf of the London and District Labour Council and as a member of the machinists union. I am also on the housing co-op board. I have been a municipal candidate three times. I am a full-time metal worker, for 15 years, and I have also studied politics at the University of Western Ontario.

The first point I would like to make is that it seems that it is the fate of Canadians to discuss eternally the imminent breakup of Canada. We have been doing this now for hundreds of years, but still we are together, sort of. The rules and agenda of this discussion have been controlled by our political élites. These élites have usually talked behind closed doors to themselves.

Premier Bob Rae, a new and unorthodox member of the power élite, has had a novel idea: Why not ask the people of Ontario what they want? Well, here we are. I represent 25,000 members of the London and District Labour Council.

Power is what this whole debate is about. Who has power? Who does not have power? How is power shared and for whose benefit? We need to go back to a couple of historical events in order to set this debate in its proper context. These events have been deliberately overlooked and downplayed by the gatekeepers of the post. We also have to see clearly the international context within which today's debate takes place.

The first historical event is the British conquest of New France in 1759. Canada and our national problem were not founded on peaceful evolution. Canada was started because of a series of violent and deadly wars that were raging in Europe. The wars spilled over into the New World when one colonial power captured lands and the other was not very keen to get them back.

The foundation of our nation is therefore fundamentally flawed. We, the English, stole New France from the French, who had in turn stolen it from the aboriginal peoples. The great task before us is to try to build a nation on such a poor foundation. How do we redress the wrongs without destroying the nation?

The answer lies in another brief flash of Canadian history. One hundred and fifty-four years ago the rebellions of 1837 and 1838 broke out in both Upper and Lower Canada. As in all wars, to the victor goes the spoils and the historical record. The result is that there has been a very earnest attempt to rewrite the popular history of these rebellions.

The rebellions of 1837 and 1838 were serious social upheavals that came very close to success. Thousands of rebels participated, hundreds were jailed and exiled, scores were killed or executed. Why is this important? Two reasons stand out. The first is that these rebellions so terrified the British that they realized that the only way to keep Canada was to allow democracy. People died to lay the

foundation of today's democracy, a democracy that most Canadians take for granted and treat with apathy.

The second reason the rebellions are important is because it was one of the few times the ordinary people of Quebec and Ontario were united against a common enemy. The enemy was British colonialism and even worse, the Family Compact and the Château Clique. The unity of French and English did not last long as the authorities brutally regained control but the historical precedent was set.

So now we move to the present. Things have not changed so much since 1837. The descendants of the Family Compact and of the Château Clique are still alive and well and still in charge. The descendants of the rebels are still here but we have abandoned the call for armed rebellion now that we have democracy. We see the election of the NDP government in Ontario as the rebels finally capturing the Legislative Assembly. It took a long time, but we did it.

Perhaps now with the input of the working people of Ontario we can work toward solving some of our basic problems. The Ontario government could assist us by taking the cultural lead in promoting a more popular and working-class history of Canada that unites rather than divides Canadians.

So what about the constitutional division of powers? The problem that most working people have is that they do have the faintest idea of who has what constitutional power. Too many powers are divided between too many jurisdictions. The confusion allows people to become cynical and apathetic; all the better for the power élites. The system must be simplified, streamlined and overlapping jurisdictions eliminated.

The other day someone told me that Bob Rae should straighten out unemployment insurance. That is the sort of thing we have.

We do not accept the idea of the Allaire report that all these new powers go to Quebec in the form of sovereignty-association. Either Quebec accepts the strong centralist government or it separates. If we allow sovereignty-association in Quebec, the stage will be set for power-grabbing by the other provinces. National standards must be maintained and equalization payments continued. The implementation of the national agenda could still be done in a decentralized manner by the provinces, cities or local initiatives. The co-operative housing program in Ontario is a good example of this type of decentralized local economic development that meets a national need.

One of the things I want to ask is, are the provinces the problem? London has twice the population of Prince Edward Island. The boundaries for the provinces were done on an ad hoc basis over an historical period of time and they have led to big population imbalances from province to province. Maybe what we need is a constituent assembly and a referendum to try to sort out that problem. We must have a strong federal state, but maybe the problem is the provinces, their size and their boundaries.

Real power should also be developed by the aboriginal peoples. Their demand for self-government is just and long overdue. The poverty and economic dependence of most

native people is due to their lack of control over their own resources: pulp, timber, oil, agriculture. A sound economic base with proper training and capital would allow the scattered native culture, government and social services to be rebuilt. The native peoples are also the founding nations of Canada.

The Canadian Senate is one place that should not receive more power. The Senate should be abolished. Regional interests in Ottawa should continue to be carried out by federal-provincial conferences. An elected Senate would just create another expensive level of government. A lot more national unity could be achieved by giving the savings to the CBC.

The Allaire report complains about Canada's national debt and implies that it is caused by strong federalism. The point missed is the tremendous debt of Quebec Hydro which is almost equal to the national debt.

Is the breakup of Canada and the control of Quebec through massive foreign debt a plan by the United States and multinational corporations to secure cheap power? The aboriginal people who live on the James Bay hydro sites have a far stronger claim to this land than does Quebec or foreign powers. Ontario should also take note that there is a parallel here with Ontario Hydro and more massive debt. Energy conservation is also good for the constitutional process, federalism and local economic control and development.

As labour leaders we would like to turn our attention to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The results of the charter process have been disappointing. The attempt to define our rights on paper has led to weakened rights with many people excluded. Defining rights through the court process is time-consuming, expensive and unpredictable. Working people cannot afford to participate in this middle-class game.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms is also flawed because all the rights are middle-class, individual rights. The process has denied group rights or collective rights. Groups such as trade unions, women, ethnic minorities, consumers all had legislative rights prior to the charter which are now under attack. I, as an individual, have a right to join groups which collectively do a far better job of protecting my individual rights than I can do as an individual. Freedom of speech and the right to strike for trade unions and other groups is being constantly eroded.

A great irony of being a working person is that we can have great individual freedoms while sitting at home watching TV, but when we walk through the factory gate we enter a police state. Working people must have economic democracy and control over our future.

1610

Recognizing the ethnic diversity of Ontario and Canada is also very important to the labour movement. London, with over 300,000 people, has a large number of ethnic communities, especially among working people. Our labour council meetings look a lot more like the United Nations than corporate board meetings. When we discuss issues such as war and peace, all sides have their spokespeople. The ethnic diversity of Canada should be maintained and encouraged.

The northern territories are also an area of Canada that needs more power. The territories should become provinces. Steps should be taken immediately to develop a viable economic base for the north. The populations should be increased dramatically to secure our claim on this territory.

What are some of the national institutions that bind Canada together? The mass media are probably the most important. The CBC, TVOntario and other public media play a vital unifying role. A better job should be done to promote working-class culture and history, including theatre, music and art, again to promote our similarities. The problem is that Brian Mulroney is systematically destroying the public media as part of the worldwide corporate agenda. Public media should not be expected to make a profit. They should be expected to hold the country together. The CBC should return to offering ideas instead of the current mindless Yankee spectator sports and Ed Sullivan reruns.

Other unifying forces in Canada are national, universal social services. Education and health must be protected from the corporate agenda of creating a parallel system for the rich. When the rich can continue to send their children to Upper Canada College, they will have no interest in paying for or supporting a public system. Even the long-term interests of the rich are harmed by this attitude because they cannot get hard-working, well-trained and quality-conscious workers. The problem is that short-term greed wins out.

The Chair: Mr Warren, if you could sum up, please.

Mr Warren: I would also comment that Quebec is a distinct society. This society has suffered repression and discrimination in the past but we must work out these problems within the national context or else we will see the rest of the country destroyed.

I also make comments on the current international economic situation. The main point there is that you cannot give away powers to the provinces at the same time that you give away national economic power to the Americans. There will be no power left in Ottawa when the next election happens. This is part of someone's agenda.

Finally, I would like to say that the 1980s decade of greed must be replaced by the 1990s decade of need. Can we take care of all these problems in the short time that remains? The answer is that we have no alternative. We must all work together. As we said at the beginning of our presentation, power is what this debate is about and it must be returned to ordinary people.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Warren. We will take a look at your entire presentation.

DENNIS HUDECKI

The Chair: I now invite Dr Dennis Hudecki from the University of Western Ontario.

Dr Hudecki: I will keep this as short as possible. I have already edited quite a bit as I was sitting back there.

If I bring any expertise here today, it is the expertise that I bring as a philosopher that helps develop the ability to arrive at some conceptual clarity. I am here to make a thesis and a proposal. My thesis is that it is possible to give

special powers to Quebec in order to preserve and promote Quebec nationalist aspirations without disturbing the symmetry of equality between the provinces. Quebec nationalism can be maintained and encouraged, I am arguing, without granting special status to Quebec.

Let me explain my thesis further. I suggest that the Ontario government recognize that in Canada today there are three dominant forces or tendencies or philosophies that are attempting to form the Canada of tomorrow, and that it is conceptually impossible to combine all three. The three tendencies in Canada are: one, the Pierre Trudeau-Clyde Wells brand of federalism; two, the provincialism or the compact theory of Canada, the view that Canada is essentially a union of provinces, a view that is traditionally pushed by Alberta and several provinces, including Quebec; three, Quebec nationalism.

I suggest that it is impossible to combine all three into a happy synthesis, because provincialism and federalism run in exactly the opposite direction to one another. If you are supportive of one, you are logically against the other. Quebec nationalism I argue is compatible with either federalism or provincialism. I am here today to argue that the Ontario government should embrace and welcome Quebec nationalism, but that it also combine the support of nationalism with a strong support for the Wells-Trudeau style of federalism.

Again my thesis is that federalism and Quebec nationalism can make a wonderful marriage. The synthesis of provincialism and Quebec nationalism, which the provincial NDP and Liberals supported in the Meech Lake process, was an intellectual and political disaster. I am saying that we ought to embrace Quebec and its aspirations but do so in a federalist, not a provincialist framework. That is where the NDP and Liberals went wrong provincially the last time.

Let me say just a very little bit about each of the three tendencies. Federalism as defined by Trudeau says, first, that Canada is a land; second, that on this land citizens enjoy full and equal human rights; third, that this country has two official languages, French and English, both equally important; fourth, that there are many cultures; fifth, and least important, that this country is made up of 10 provinces and two territories.

This view of Canada stresses togetherness, not division; it stresses bilingualism, an expansion of consciousness versus duality, Mulroney's favourite word, which connotes separateness and division. Trudeau's view of Canada is of a bilingual, multicultural country held together by human and economic rights. This is a grand vision and Ontario should support it wholeheartedly.

Provincialism, on the contrary, sees Canada as a collection of provinces, each being headed by a Premier; each Premier being a head of his or her little fiefdom. There are many things the matter with this view of Canada, but I will only mention that it will lead to a weak, exploitable country. Provincialism results in provinces all going in different directions and the country as a whole going around in circles. The Ontario government should oppose provincialism, embrace federalism and Quebec nationalism.

Let me now explain why I see Quebec nationalism as not only being compatible with Trudeau-Wells federalism but an essential part of it. Premier Wells of Newfoundland defines Canada as three equalities: equality of citizenship under the Charter of Rights; equality of French and English languages, and equality of the provinces. The problem facing Canada today can be expressed most accurately using Wells's categories.

The equality of the provinces clashes with the principle concerning the equality of languages. Why? Most French-speaking Canadians live in Quebec. Many of the cultural and economic institutions that maintain the French language are provincial in character or should be. But it appears that if we grant the power to Quebec to promote and maintain the French language, we will be making Quebec a province different from all the others. We will be making it a province that has special status.

Some people, for example, the philosopher Will Kymlicka in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, argue that if special powers go to Quebec, the idea of a symmetrical federalism, that is, 10 equal provinces, goes out the window. But we do not have to look at it that way. We should distinguish between Quebec as a constitutional province the same as all the rest and Quebec as a place where the French fact in Canada is centred. We should give special powers to Quebec, not in the name of special status to Quebec but in the name of preserving one of Canada's fundamental equalities, the equality of the French language to the English.

That Quebec will, as a byproduct, end up receiving unique powers is not a cut against the principle of provincial equality any more than is the fact that some people collect unemployment insurance while others do not is a cut against equality of citizenship before the government. The government gives unemployment insurance to some and not to others not because some people have special

status, but rather to further the right of equal opportunity for all. That some rights clash with others is true. This happens in every constitutional democracy. Decisions have to be made sometimes between conflicting sets of rights, but such decisions do not imply an overall lack of equality.

To conclude—and I really appreciate the time you have given me here—I am proposing that the Ontario government wholeheartedly embrace Quebec nationalism as part of a wider federalist thrust and that it does so not in the name of special status for Quebec, but rather in the name of protecting one of our fundamental equalities, namely, the equality between French and English.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr Hudecki. We will end there, and I apologize to the groups that we did not manage to reach. We just did not have the time. To the London North New Democratic Party Riding Association, I do note that we have your brief and we have distributed that to members of the committee. To the others that we could not hear, again our apologies.

We have certainly heard in the six hours that we have spent here in London here today in hearings a great number of interesting and useful presentations. I think that it was clear throughout the morning and this afternoon that a lot of thought has gone into the presentations. There was a healthy mixture of rationale and passion in the presentations, and I think that Londoners certainly have given us a number of useful insights into the things that we need to address as a province and as a country.

We thank you for that and we invite you to continue following our proceedings if you are interested, as all of our hearings will continue to be broadcast over the parliamentary channel. We will be moving this evening to Kitchener and proceeding tomorrow to Brantford and Hamilton. Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

The committee recessed at 1624.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1929 at the Rockway Gardens Senior Citizens' Centre, Kitchener.

The Chair: On behalf of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, I want to say we are pleased to be here this evening in Kitchener to hear the views of the people of this community on Ontario in Confederation and on the various aspects dealing with the future of our country and our province.

We have heard in the days till now a number of interesting and useful suggestions in the various locations we visited. Earlier today we were in London and heard from a number of people there. The day before that, we were in Windsor, and tomorrow we will be proceeding to Brantford and then to Hamilton. We then have another week of travel next week in the eastern part of the province before we conclude our hearings. Then we will be putting together an interim report by 21 March.

This is an all-party committee made up of representatives of the three political parties represented at Queen's Park. I want to introduce the members of the committee who are here. From the NDP caucus we have Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson, who is also Vice-Chair of the committee, Marilyn Churley, Will Ferguson, Ellen MacKinnon and David Winninger. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative Caucus we have Elizabeth Witmer and Ted Arnett. With that introduction, I will proceed.

Some names have already been given to me, so I will begin with those and then we will carry through. We will try to alternate between organizations and individuals. Obviously, given the number of individuals, we will deal with more individuals than organizations.

I should explain, because the proceedings are also being televised over the parliamentary network and there may be people watching the proceedings outside of the Kitchener area, that we are in Kitchener, as I said before, and we are proceeding this evening in a less formal way than we have done in the past. We have a number of people who have indicated that they wish to speak to the committee. We have agreed that we would ask groups and organizations to limit their comments to up to 10 minutes and individuals to up to five minutes, and we will see if the time allows some questions from members of the committee.

SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL OF KITCHENER-WATERLOO

The Chair: Could I begin with the Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo?

Mr Robinson: Mr Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Paul Robinson and I am the president of the Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo. With me is Ernie Ginsler, the executive director of the council.

The Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo is a non-profit, community-based organization committed to the betterment of the community in its broadest sense. We

appreciate the opportunity to speak to you tonight in your opening phase of deliberations. We have chosen not to speak directly to your questions as outlined in your discussion document. Rather, we want to share with you our perception of the ideals which bind us together as Canadians.

As I am sure you are aware, Canada is a signatory to the United Nations' Declaration on Human Rights. What most Canadians do not realize is that there is a covenant to that document dealing with social and cultural rights which Canada has also signed. This latter document requires that all Canadians have access to adequate food, housing, health services, clothing and other necessities of life.

Canada, we believe, is unique among countries in that it has made an honest attempt to live up to much of what this undertaking requires, and it has had to overcome its Constitution to do so. However, although much has been done much still needs to be accomplished.

One of the traditions that sets us apart among the nations is our system of national standards and national incentives for many human services. Health care is the most obvious example. The Canada Health Act requires that access to health care be free, universal, equally accessible and be administered on a non-profit basis. The net effect is that at least in theory one should not be at a disadvantage in obtaining health care whether one lives in Blind River or in Toronto, in a Newfoundland outport or in Montreal.

Canada's vast distances play an intervening role, but beyond physical access the other standards hold true throughout the nation. The Canada assistance plan ensures that even the poorest province in Canada can provide welfare and support services to its residents by contributing 50% of the cost of those programs. Although social assistance levels vary, and no one would claim they are adequate, federal governments have made a commitment to lessen the effects of regional disparity on Canadians' ability to survive.

Similarly, the established programs financing act provides a mechanism to ensure that all provinces can afford a high level of health and post-secondary education appropriate to their population. The recent statement by the Economic Council of Canada once again points out the importance of education and training to Canada's future. Without federal assistance, some regions of Canada would become educational and therefore economic backwaters. What is perhaps unique about these agreements is that they provide a mechanism to circumvent the federal and provincial roles established in the British North America Act. All of these areas were originally exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provinces. Canada's reality, however, required that we find a mechanism to hold us together, and established programs financing and the Canada assistance plan along with equalization grants were among the most important.

This pragmatic federalism, our desire to ensure that none among us suffers simply because of geography, and our willingness to share our resources to guarantee this

ideal, is one of the key identifying traits of the Canadian character. We are aware that the current federal government is backing away from its commitments under both established programs financing and the Canada assistance plan. We cannot help but fear that this move will do nothing but accentuate the differences among provinces and give us less reason to stay together as a nation.

Similar to Canada's support for regional and economic diversity is our support and encouragement of ethnocultural diversity. Unlike the melting-pot philosophy of our neighbours to the south, Canada has chosen to promote a philosophy supporting a mosaic of cultures. Both nationally and provincially we have policies and programs supporting multiculturalism. Again, this illustrates our national penchant for tying the country together through supports to all our constituent parts.

Many countries promote the right of all their citizens to be equal. Canada is perhaps unique among these countries in supporting just as strongly its citizens' right to be different. The social planning council believes that Canada is more than the sum of its parts. We believe strongly that there is a benefit to all Canadians to stay together as a country. We believe that one of the keys to that togetherness is the contribution of our national government to standards and funding, and we believe that the central government must be potent in relation to the provinces to accomplish this.

We would urge you in the strongest possible manner to insist on this in any future negotiations.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We could probably allow one quick question.

Mr Beer: Thank you very much for your presentation. There has been a lot of discussion in the newspapers in the last week or so that the federal government may be cutting back even further. We know the federal budget is coming up next week. Particularly in this whole social, health and education area, do you have any understanding in terms of the council here of whether those cutbacks are going to continue? As you underlined, for the province to continue to provide and indeed expand support for programs in those areas, the Canada assistance plan, the established programs financing, all of those are critical and we are talking about 50-cent dollars. What is your sense of the direction? Frankly, from what I have been reading I am very worried that there is almost a kind of de facto shift going on in terms of placing the financial responsibility increasingly on the province, which also means there is a heavier weight on local government, and we get into all of the problems of trying to fund those programs.

Mr Robinson: I would like Ernie Ginsler to respond to that. He is a little more in tune with the details than I am.

Mr Ginsler: We have no more direct access to what the federal government is intending to do in its upcoming budget than anybody else, and probably less than many.

The trend for the last five or six years has been to diminish the federal role in supporting national programs through CAP, through established programs financing. There has been nothing to indicate that there is going to be

a change in direction. Our fear is that a continuation of the weakening of the federal contribution continues to weaken the links among the provinces, it continues to weaken what holds us together, and that is our ability to support regions, to support sectors of the province, through a strong central mechanism. Without that, for many parts of this country there is no reason to belong.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

1940

CONSEIL SCOLAIRE DES ÉCOLES SÉPARÉES DE WELLINGTON

The Chair: Could I call next Pierrette Servos.

Mme Servos : Je représente la section de langue française du Conseil scolaire des écoles séparées de Wellington. Monsieur le Président, mesdames et messieurs, Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, la section de langue française vous remercie de l'occasion qui lui est donnée de s'exprimer quant au futur des francophones de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération canadienne. La section de langue française du Conseil scolaire se compose de trois membres élus par les francophones du Conseil de Wellington. La communauté de langue française de notre région s'est regroupée autour de son école élémentaire de langue française, l'école Saint-René-Goupil, dès sa fondation il y a 17 ans.

Les parents francophones qui désirent que leurs enfants continuent leur éducation dans leur langue maternelle, n'ayant pas accès à une école secondaire dans ce comté, doivent présentement les acheminer vers l'école secondaire George-P-Vanier de Hamilton. C'est grâce aux efforts que notre communauté et ainsi le gouvernement de l'Ontario ont fournis et continueront de fournir, que nos enfants en arriveront un jour à faire leurs études du jardin à l'université dans leur langue maternelle, le français. Il nous semble tout à fait juste que les citoyens de langue française de cette province puissent faire ce choix, le français étant une des deux langues officielles du Canada. En retour, l'instruction qu'ils auront reçue dans les deux langues officielles de leur pays les aidera à mieux servir cette province qui les aura traités d'une façon équitable.

J'aimerais signaler que plus de 30% de la population du Canada réside en Ontario. De ce fait, celle-ci se trouve dans une situation privilégiée pour aller de l'avant et démontrer son initiative et sa vision à l'ensemble du Canada en faisant la promotion des deux langues officielles du pays. Elle devrait faire ce geste avec conviction et fierté en tenant compte des avantages que cette démarche pourrait apporter dans les domaines politique, économique et culturel à l'intérieur du pays aussi bien qu'à l'extérieur.

Nous recommandons au gouvernement de l'Ontario que les efforts suivants soient poursuivis et intensifiés. Les services fournis dans le cadre de la Loi 8 ; l'amélioration du processus pour fournir l'éducation élémentaire et secondaire en français à travers la province, certains éléments de ce processus étant le recensement, le financement et la gestion authentiques de nos institutions ; la mise en oeuvre des recommandations de la commission Bourdeau pour l'établissement de collèges communautaires, que le gouvernement de l'Ontario se mette à l'écoute des Franco-

Ontariens quant à la fondation d'une université de langue française ; que l'Ontario soit finalement déclaré officiellement bilingue ; et finalement, que le gouvernement de l'Ontario continue à être compréhensif et sympathique aux aspirations légitimes de tous les groupes minoritaires.

C'est avec respect et de bonne foi que je suis venue au nom de la section de langue française de Wellington vous présenter notre vision de l'Ontario de l'an 2000, une province dans laquelle tous les Ontariens de langue française pourraient se sentir chez eux et participer aux progrès et à la prospérité de cette belle et unique province. Je vous remercie.

The Chair: Merci, madame. Are there questions?

[Interruption]

The Chair: No. Let's just be clear about something. Our proceedings are in English or French as the speakers choose. There are, I believe, some—

[Interruption]

The Chair: Sir. We are going to do our best to run the meeting as smoothly as we can. We want the co-operation of the audience to do that, please. Our proceedings as a committee of the Legislature allow us to proceed in English or French. We are going to continue to do that. If people in the audience need translation devices, there are some available at the back of the room. They can work to go in either direction, from English to French or French to English, because there is simultaneous translation. I invite people who want to make use of those to sign those out at the back of the room and make use of those.

I think there were some questions.

Ms Servos: I can take the question in English. I can speak English.

The Chair: Well, that will happen. Members of the committee will speak in either language.

Madame, vous pouvez répondre en français ou en anglais, comme vous voulez.

Ms Churley: Unfortunately, I am one of the ones who cannot speak French, which I regret and I am working on it very hard at the moment.

I am just wondering what your position is right now on the threat of Quebec possibly, of course if we cannot work things out, leaving Canada and how you feel that might affect French-speaking people in Ontario. Do you think it is important to your continuing rights to have Quebec in as part of the country?

Ms Servos: No. As much as I would not like to see Quebec separate, I think for the French Ontarians, you will have to know it is historical. Some people, some families have been here for 300 years. They are Canadians, French-speaking Canadians, and they are not Quebecers. They do not come from Quebec. Some of them have never been to Quebec. It is a right, it is historical, it is a constitutional right, so I think that what we would like Ontario to do, and that is what I said, is we want Ontario to continue what it has been doing for bilingualism in this country and for the French Canadians. I am sure life will go on, and we hope so.

ALVIN SMITH

The Chair: Could I invite next Alvin Smith. While Mr Smith is coming forward, could I note the presence in the room this evening of a former MPP for Kitchener, David Cooke.

Go ahead, sir.

Mr Smith: Good evening, Mr Chairman and members of the select committee. I am a representative for the Waterloo regional deaf community.

To begin, I would like to give you a little bit of background on myself. I attended a provincial school for the deaf in Milton, Ontario, as well as Belleville. That was in the 1960s.

At that time sign language was not used in the classroom by our teachers. Rather than that, we were forced to try to understand our teachers by lipreading them. Now that is an individual talent. Some deaf individuals can while others cannot. So for those who could not lipread, I ask you to try to imagine what type of education they were exposed to.

Now that American sign language is starting to finally gain recognition I am quite happy about that. I am hoping that through that we will have more deaf people with white collar jobs.

I finished school in 1969, and around 1975 teletype telecommunication devices started to come into existence for deaf people. Then later, in the late 1970s or the early 1980s, interpreting services began to evolve, followed by closed-captioning devices. Into the 1980s, the Bell relay service came into existence for us, which is a message relay service through the telephone system. I think, technically speaking, accessibility is improving as well as services for the deaf.

Now that we are into the 1990s, I am hoping that we can gain the support of the Ontario government in ensuring that even greater access is given to us. An example of this would be to have any public telephone booth accessible for Tty or telecommunication devices in transportation stations, be they bus depots or train stations, government buildings, restaurants, public stores, in addition to numerous others. Accessibility is of vital importance to us.

1950

For those people who are not deaf, they are able to rent telephones as well as telephone services, and in the event they are in need of repair, a replacement is given while the unit is being repaired, free of charge.

For deaf people, we have to buy our telephone equipment, not the telephone itself but the equipment, and then if something needs to be repaired, it is a cost that we have to cover, in addition to having to rent the Tty. We would like to see some equity in the cost of having to repair our own units.

Another example is we all rent cable television services from cable companies, but for us to have access to this we have to buy a special piece of equipment which enables us to view the closed-captioning in addition to the cable cost. And we are paying the same rental fee per month that those people who are non-deaf do and they have access, whereas we have to incur an additional cost.

When deaf people want to purchase a telecommunication device for the deaf or a closed-captioning decoder and we want to claim this on our income tax, we have to go through the process of seeing a medical doctor to have the forms signed to verify that we are deaf, and believe it or not some doctors charge a \$25 fee for this signature. On this issue we do not think that we should have to go through this because they do not believe that we are deaf.

My fifth issue I would like to bring up this evening deals with stores. If we purchase something from a store, the amount is not visually shown to us and we have to literally almost climb over the counter to be able to see what the amount we have to pay is. This visual information is not made available to us.

There are many handicapped people who have difficulty finding equity with employment. An example is that when handicapped people do go for job interviews, the tendency is that they are told, "We'll put your résumé on file and we'll be in touch," and that is as far as it goes. They do not hear another word from the potential employer, and in a lot of cases this is due to discrimination.

We want the Ontario government to introduce a law which is encouraging to employers to hire handicapped and disabled people, and as well to ensure that we have equity in promotional aspects of any job, because historically deaf people have been denied promotions.

The next issue I would like to bring up is the education level of many deaf Canadians. Due to this fact, their income is equivalent to their education. Many deaf people, or some, would like to attend colleges or university, but they need some kind of financial assistance to be able to enter into the post-secondary education.

Bill 82 is strongly opposed by the deaf community. We feel that the culture of deaf people, with this bill being passed, will diminish and in fact will die. I want you to remember that in North Bay, which you were visiting throughout your tour of Ontario, it was stated by a deaf person that he feels left out in a world of hearing people, that he feels left out in another world. It can be very isolating because we do not have access to auditory ability. I am very grateful to my parents in that they knew what was best for me and that the appropriate place for my education would be a provincial school for the deaf, because there I have an identity and am on par with other students, in comparison to the gentleman who spoke in North Bay whose situation was not similar to mine at all.

From generation to generation of deaf people, that can happen and because of Bill 82 future generations of deaf people can suffer and our culture can be adversely affected. Bill 82 is something that we are opposed to—excuse me, possibly Bill 82 is appropriate to other handicapped people and their education process; I do not know. I would suggest that you sit down and discuss this with other disabled groups, but speaking from the deaf community's perspective, this is not a bill we are in agreement with.

You have to understand that our culture is something that we are very, very proud of and we do not, and I repeat do not, want anyone to take this away from us. Thank you from me personally and thank you from the deaf community for listening this evening.

Mr Bisson: Very quickly, for the benefit of those who do not know what Bill 82 is, I wonder if you can give a little summary of Bill 82 and the opposition.

Mr Smith: Sure. Bill 82 I think came about in 1985 or the process started around then, where plans were going to be implemented to close provincial schools and any school for the handicapped. Living in Kitchener, those deaf students would have to be mainstreamed into a public school, as well as being in a special class for handicapped students. It would be a small class, specifically speaking for deaf students, but they would not be integrated within the mainstream program.

The Chair: We are going to have to move on. Thank you very much, Mr Smith.

2000

MARK WHALEY

The Chair: Could I invite next Mark Whaley. I also understand that Mike Cooper is here, one of our MPPs and I invite him to join us at the table, if he wishes. I see him at the back.

Mr Cooper: I am fine here, thank you very much.

The Chair: Okay, as you wish. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Whaley: Good evening and welcome to the region of Waterloo. I am Mark Whaley. It is a safe bet that if you put all the available demographic information into our computer—average age, average income, average family size and education—you would come out with a picture of a fellow who was pretty much just like myself.

While being considered the average guy may sometimes not be too flattering, it does give me an interesting perspective on the state of our nation at the present time and I hope you will agree that my ground-level vision will make a refreshing change from all the sermons sent down from our national and provincial capitals.

One of the things I have learned here with my nose to the ground is that a person's culture is much more important than his politics and this truism is substantiated with every passing day both here and around the world. In the past year, for example, the German people put their culture before their politics when the country reunified at enormous expense to its citizens that will impact on them for many years to come. The people believed that their culture was worth the price and the world cheered their efforts. Right now in Lithuania the people want to bring their culture to the forefront, even though the price that they are paying goes far beyond politics and economics and into the realm of bloodshed and imprisonment. Again the world cheers.

But here in Canada such a natural evolution has met with great resistance, particularly from some noted politicians, and it is wonderful to participate in a town hall meeting such as this to have the average person's viewpoint heard. Recent developments in Canada have given rise to two strong groups within our boundaries wanting to assert their culture before politics. Our native peoples are seeking some kind of self-determination and Quebec wants sovereignty.

The native question seems to require more deliberation, but in terms of Quebec, those who cannot see that Quebec is a separate culture from the rest of this Dominion, a very distinct society, need only spend some time there interacting with the people and the different way of life here, and I am sure that this is all that it will take for you to see for yourself. *Vive la différence.*

Those who will not see that it is a culture apart will be the ones who will be most surprised when the inevitable happens, as in the other examples I have mentioned, and Quebec puts its significant culture ahead of its politics and finds its own way into nationhood. They seem prepared to pay the price in terms of order and economics to see their culture flourish, and the world will cheer.

There is a growing movement in the rest of Canada to see our neighbours fulfil a richer cultural identity. Yes, the fabric of our present nation will change, but who says it has to be a static thing? The federalist drum-thumpers are out of step with a great many average Canadians who wish *Quebec au revoir et à bientôt.* We will be the best of neighbours and still good friends.

Mr Offer: Mr Whaley, you have painted a picture that talks about how the inevitable will happen, either there is to be a federalism, a strong central government, or if there is not, then there is to be a separation. I wonder if you could share with us whether there is something in between, maybe a less strong central government, but not necessarily that which results in a separation of Quebec from the rest of Canada, whether there is some accommodation that we in the province of Ontario and other provinces should be looking at vis-à-vis our relations with the province of Quebec.

Mr Whaley: I heard a political scientist from Dalhousie University speak to the Spicer commission and he talked about having what is referred to as a double referendum; that is, ask Quebec if it wants sovereignty and then ask the rest of Canada if it wants sovereignty as well, and this double referendum would be a way whereby we could get Canada's true feeling. My opinion is the rest of Canada does not have a say in it. Quebec holds its own destiny in its own hands now because we have turned our backs on Quebec with the failure of Meech Lake.

TERRANCE STEVEN CARTER

The Chair: Could I call next Terrance Steven Carter. Mr Carter, go ahead.

Mr Carter: Mr Chair, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity of appearing before the committee tonight. My name is Terrance Carter and I am a lawyer practising in Orangeville. Although my home is now in Orangeville, I was born and raised in Montreal until 1975, when I left Quebec at the age of 22 to study law in Toronto.

My decision to leave Quebec was due more to pragmatic considerations than to politics or the threat of separation. In essence, my inability to master the French language made it impractical for me to practice law in Quebec. As such, I moved to Ontario along with a great many other English Quebecers of my generation to build my home and career here. Ontario has been good to me

and it is now my home by choice. But still there is a part of me that remains attached to Quebec. For me the uniqueness and the culture and the people of Quebec that extends beyond the simple differences in language constitutes a fundamental part of our Canadian experience. The history of Canada clearly reflects the ongoing resolution and evolution of the dichotomy of two of our founding peoples.

I suppose if anyone should be resentful concerning the rise of Quebec nationalism, it should be those of my generation who felt compelled for whatever reason to leave Quebec. That, however, has not been my experience. Instead, I feel I have been enriched by the opportunity of being raised in and influenced by a culture other than my own. Surely the country we want to build for our children should be broader than just a one-dimensional monolith. Instead, I believe we should be encouraging and enjoying the diversity of both of our cultures of French and English, and for that matter all other cultures that are a part of what has been called the Canadian mosaic.

I recently wondered, though, why this goal of diversity in language and cultures has been so difficult to accomplish. I believe the problem lies not necessarily with the limitations of our politicians or the official programs that have been implemented but rather with the attitudes and the opinions of the general population in both English and French Canada. On the one hand, English Canada feels it has done everything possible to accommodate Quebec. Quebec, on the other hand, feels it has gone the extra mile time and time again to remain a part of Canada. The result has been a serious and deeply inflicted wound in both English and French Canada, causing bitterness and distrust where once understanding and a mood of conciliation prevailed.

The decade of the 1980s has added a further dimension to the constitutional debate through the introduction of the all-too-pervasive attitude of the "me generation." As a result, people, politicians and even provinces have become accustomed to asking: "What's in it for me? What's in it for my province?" before asking, "What's good for Canada as a whole?" The purpose of my appearance before this select committee is to provide at least some general recommendations that may hopefully assist in overcoming the attitude of distrust and uncertainty that has developed.

First, if we are to rekindle an attitude of reconciliation between Quebec and the rest of Canada, we in English Canada should take the initiative to experience and appreciate the Quebec culture. Similarly, Quebec should attempt to do the same in relation to appreciating the strengths to be offered in English Canada. I believe there are practical and relatively easy ways in which the general population of Ontario and other provinces can make overtures to Quebec. For instance, our provincial government could institute a program whereby municipalities in both Ontario and Quebec could become twinned with each other and exchange ideas on matters as challenging as the treatment of minority languages to more basic issues such as similar problems to be encountered in running municipal governments. Another example would be to implement exchange programs among community groups such as local churches.

Second, we need to concentrate our attention more on the strengths that result from maintaining a viable Confederation than in allowing our attention to be diverted by those who are lobbying for the breakup of Canada. In this regard, I find as little that is attractive about the prospect of a geographically divided English Canada as I do in the claims of the Quebec nationalists that Quebec can function effectively independently outside of Confederation.

Third, the hurts and the wounds that have been festering concerning Quebec's future in Confederation need time to heal. Even though we are facing deadlines established by politicians at both the federal and the provincial level, we as the people of Ontario need to alleviate some of the tension that has developed by being both individually and collectively patient, slow to react and conciliatory in our attitudes.

Fourth, I believe the government of Ontario can play a key role in fostering a spirit of reconciliation for the country as a whole during the current process of nation building. In the past, Ontario has consistently chosen the high road in emphasizing the interests of Canada as a whole instead of limiting its scope to only provincial issues. I would encourage you as members of the committee during the upcoming constitutional debate to continue the tradition of choosing this higher ground. I believe there are enough participants in the current debate who are concerned only with the interests of their own immediate sphere. What we need are leaders and Canadians who are prepared to ask what they can give to Canada instead of what they can first receive in return.

Fifth and last, I believe it is time our country looked to God for help. I, for one, as a Christian, and I am not embarrassed to say that, believe Canadians need to pray for our country and our political leaders. If we put our trust in God during this crisis I believe He will not allow our country, so rich in heritage, to easily dissolve.

I trust that my comments before the committee will be of some assistance in the upcoming constitutional debate. I again thank you for the privilege of being allowed to appear before your committee on no less important an issue than the future of our nation.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Carter.

2010

ASSOCIATION DES ENSEIGNANTES ET DES ENSEIGNANTS FRANCO-ONTARIENS

The Chair: Could I call next Thérèse Bathnagar.

[Interruption]

Ms Bathnagar: He told me he would not bug me.

M. le Président : Vous pouvez nous adresser en français ou en anglais, madame.

Mme Bathnagar : En français, c'est bien.

Nous tenons à remercier le comité Silipo de nous donner l'occasion de faire entendre notre opinion sur un sujet qui nous tient grandement à coeur, c'est-à-dire celui de l'avenir et du rôle de l'Ontario français au sein de la Confédération. Nous représentons le chapitre de Guelph de l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens. L'école Saint-René-Goupil, où nous enseignons,

existe depuis 17 ans et est la seule école française dans le comté de Wellington. Le fort désir que nous partageons tous est de donner à nos élèves un enseignement de qualité de leur permettre de pouvoir poursuivre leurs études en français et de les voir devenir des adultes fiers de leurs origines franco-ontariennes et désirant prendre part à la croissance de leur pays et la raison principale qui nous pousse à nous adresser à ce comité.

Qui peut prétendre devenir bilingue et maîtriser la langue française s'il ne fréquente que d'écoles élémentaires en français ? Afin d'assurer une continuité, ne faudrait-il pas dispenser d'enseignement secondaire ainsi que postsecondaire en français aussi ? Le Vice-Président du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération déclarait à l'Express, et nous citons : «Ça fait plus de 120 ans que l'on s'obstine sur la question linguistique. Si on veut se développer comme pays, il nous faut mettre cette affaire derrière nous une fois pour toutes et reconnaître que notre pays a été bâti par deux nations, française et anglaise, et par les autochtones. Il faut être capable de reconnaître nos différences».

Le Canada, peut-il évoluer comme pays dans d'autres domaines tels que l'économie et l'écologie sans avoir au préalable réglé la question linguistique ? Peut-on solutionner ce problème de plus de 120 ans si l'on n'assure pas aux francophones et aux autochtones une éducation et des services dispensés dans leur langue ? Ne faut-il pas aussi leur fournir l'occasion de se développer à tous points de vue dans leur langue ? N'est-il pas important que les richesses francophones et autochtones soient reconnues, voire publicisées en Ontario et à l'extérieur ?

L'Ontario ne forme-t-il pas la collectivité francophone la plus nombreuse hors Québec ? Pourquoi s'assimile-t-il à un taux si alarmant ? Un demi-million d'Ontariens sont d'origine française, mais seulement 325 000 parlent encore le français tous les jours. Cet état de faits serait-il dû à l'absence d'universités et d'institutions postsecondaires francophones en Ontario ? Comment les 250 000 francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick s'y prennent-ils pour entretenir la plus grande université francophone avec ses 8000 étudiants en dehors du Québec ? L'économie du Nouveau-Brunswick va-t-elle mieux que la nôtre en Ontario ?

Notre système d'éducation se targue d'être le meilleur au Canada ; l'est-il seulement pour une des trois nations fondatrices du pays ?

Le Québec, que l'on aime à citer comme étant l'enfant-rebelle du Canada, n'a-t-il pas trois universités anglophones ?

L'Ontario, a-t-il raison d'être fier de sa politique face aux francophones et à leurs écoles secondaires et postsecondaires ? Qui gère celles-ci ? Qui dans notre comté protège la langue et la culture françaises à part l'école élémentaire francophone de Guelph ? Qu'y a-t-il en plus de cette école pour aider les francophones à conserver leur fierté ? Le temps n'est-il pas venu de nous doter d'une loi pour protéger les droits acquis ? Chaque pays de la Communauté économique européenne s'est engagé à faire la promotion de deux langues dans la communauté à tous les niveaux, outre la langue nationale.

Dans les universités de Strasbourg, siège du Parlement européen, tous les étudiants titulaires d'un diplôme universitaire du deuxième cycle devront pouvoir travailler dans trois langues, quel que soit l'enseignement poursuivi. Cette politique venant de pays plus vieux que le nôtre, pourrait-elle nous servir d'exemple de sagesse et de respect des autres nations ?

Ne serait-il pas le temps non seulement de laisser se développer un sentiment d'appartenance à une nation qui connaît le succès, mais justement d'encourager les gens à s'identifier à la nation francophone qui après tout est elle aussi une des trois nations fondatrices ? Ne faudrait-il pas qu'on cesse de considérer les francophones comme une menace, mais plutôt qu'on voit la richesse qu'il peuvent apporter ?

Sur qui doit-on compter pour préserver cette richesse, sur Ottawa ou sur Toronto ? Qui doit être bilingue, le Canada ou l'Ontario ? Qui contrôle les écoles, les bibliothèques et les centres culturels, les provinces ou le pays ? L'Ontario essaie-il de reproduire avec les francophones le génocide culturel des autochtones d'il y a à peine deux siècles ?

Des six points énumérés dans le document de la commission Pépin-Robarts, cinq s'appliquent à la société franco-ontarienne. Les Québécois, à cause de ces points, réclament d'être connus comme société distincte. Quand l'Ontario reconnaîtra-t-il ses francophones comme une société ?

Nous recommandons que le français soit reconnu langue officielle ; que l'on prône l'amélioration et la création d'écoles secondaires et postsecondaires francophones ; qu'en Ontario soit promu la richesse culturelle franco-ontarienne ; que l'Ontario reconnaisse les trois communautés nationales et le droit qu'ont celles-ci à l'éducation dans leur langue maternelle ; qu'il leur accorde également le droit de gérer leur propre système scolaire, éducatif et culturel ; qu'il fasse en sorte qu'Ottawa reconnaisse l'autodétermination de la province ; que l'Ontario fasse une chaude lutte à l'analphabétisme, surtout en milieu francophone et autochtone. Je vous remercie de m'avoir écouté.

M. Bisson : Une question un peu difficile dans cette situation : quand on entend les affaires vis-à-vis des francophones, les études des fois pas très sympatiques, disons, premièrement, qu'est-ce que ça vous fait personnellement ? Et deuxièmement, qu'est-ce que ça fait d'être capable de résoudre nos problèmes et d'être capable de continuer le processus de bâtir cette nation ?

Mme Bathnagar : La première question, qu'est-ce que ça me fait personnellement ? Ça me touche certainement et je deviens très émotive. J'ai justement eu l'expérience ce soir. Je me suis approchée de la personne et j'ai essayé de l'amadouer et de la calmer. Mais certes, j'ai ravaillé très fort pour conserver ma langue et pour être bilingue. Les remarques désobligeantes me briment beaucoup. Est-ce que je réponds à votre première question ?

M. Bisson : Oui.

Mme Bathnagar : Et votre deuxième question ?

M. Bisson : Que pensez-vous que ça fait vers la possibilité d'être capable de réconcilier les différences et rebâtir

ou continuer à bâtir cette nation, en venir finalement par dire : «Une fois pour toutes, après 123 ans, on va régler cette question-là et commencer à bâtir notre nation» ?

Mme Bathnagar : Je crois qu'il y a beaucoup de possibilités pour qu'on puisse garder le Canada intact. Je crois que des comités comme ceci, ça peut aider à amener des gens ensemble et à concilier les gens. Je crois que c'est l'ouverture d'esprit et puis donner le temps, peut-être, au Québec de se calmer après l'échec du Lac Meech. Si le Canada semblait un peu plus sympathique au dilemme dans lequel le Québec se trouve présentement, je crois qu'il y aurait beaucoup de chance qu'on garde le Canada intact.

2020

FRED HUTTER

The Chair: Could I call next Fred Hutter.

Mr Hutter: Good evening. I believe all Canadians want Quebec to stay, but only as a province equal to the others. Clyde Wells enlightened us on the basic faults of Meech. Oka taught us of Quebec's disrespect for native land claims. And now the Allaire report refutes the Supreme Court of Canada and its jurisdiction over the justice system.

A Saddam Hussein negotiating style is what we have seen. Anti-English sign laws, a rejection of attending provincial conferences and refusal to acknowledge the Charter of Rights by invoking the infamous "notwithstanding" clause are ways of saying to Canada, "It's our way or no way."

There is an element in Quebec that is bordering on fascist state creation with its racist laws, new control of immigration and above-the-law attitude. Perhaps this new cockiness has roots in Bourassa's James Bay hydro project and his dream of making Quebec the richest province or state in North America by vast flooding of the Cree Indian lands to the north for cheap power and selling it to the northeast where nuclear plants have trouble being built.

I see Ontario's role via this committee as being that, when Quebec holds its next referendum, its citizens should know the facts of life this time. Instead of viewing the future with rose-coloured glasses, the voters of Quebec should go to the polls aware of a written document illustrating to them the bad-news scenario a yes vote will cause. They know what they want, but right now are not familiar with what they do not get. Part of Ontario's role in keeping the nation together is the duty to make the people of separatist nature aware of the strong conditions that will be imposed if they leave.

In effect, I am speaking of a type of divorce agreement. This would be an agreement stating what the terms of the separation would be; a negotiating tool. It would serve two purposes: to enlighten them on what they will lose if they leave, or we can call it a Plains of Abraham manifesto and scare them into leaving. The attitude the committee takes, that Ontario takes, will make that determination.

In any divorce, ugly decisions have to be made: who gets the kids, the pet, even the photo album. The negotiations will be no exception, and the time to show French Canada the details is now, before it votes. This will inspire deeper thought into what they are doing and could lose. I

would like to mention some items that would be discussed in such a manifesto or agreement.

We have good treaty foundations for retaining most of northern Quebec, which are Cree and Inuit territories in history, not French. The 50th parallel and the Treaty of Paris border running from James Bay to Labrador will keep their interests intact via a land route across our north. Similarly, the St Lawrence River just west and south of Montreal Island and out to the Atlantic shall leave the Eastern Townships and Gaspé as a route to the Maritimes, thereby inspiring unity among the remaining provinces and providing a homeland for French, English and other Québécois who wish to stay part of Canada.

All land and buildings now federal will remain Canadian until those departments can be relocated. These lands can then be sold at a later date. Likewise, Quebec holdings and the lands retained by Canada south of the St Lawrence River and in the north can be retained by Quebec or sold later by the Quebec government. Because we keep or have the right to sell all real estate, it is not necessary to apportion Quebec's share of the national debt. Their share would be about \$95 billion, not counting the national capital area of Hull, and the Hull situation must be addressed.

The Chair: Mr Hutter, if you could sum up, please.

Mr Hutter: Okay. Referenda on the occupied islands of Anticosti and Madeleine in the St Lawrence River should determine their loyalty, whereas the vacant lands go to the closest shore. Borders and fishing rights must be established to avert disputes later.

The population will demand across Canada that all French in the courts, forms and double labelling be extinguished. No longer a founding national population, the expense and social cost of French labelling, etc, will not be tolerated.

Ontario and Canadians will forgive politicians if French Canadians separate. We promoted the eastern bloc and now the Baltics to independence, so it is hypocritical to stop Quebec. What the voters will not forgive is giving them the silver tray when they go. The break, if it happens, must be a clean and fair one. Mr Mulroney cannot negotiate. He loses his parliamentary seat when they go. Maybe that is a good reason to do it sooner.

The above points are items for Québécois to consider before a referendum. Ontario can design and maybe change destiny. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ROBERT LONDON

The Chair: I call next Robert London. And just so people know, I will be calling afterwards Martha Willis. Mr London is coming forward.

Mr London: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. I had a few things I was going to talk about that everybody already said, so I will make this as brief as possible. I think as a nation we should not be divided by language, wealth or customs. We should try to achieve a more loyal way of thinking by putting the country first. All other issues should be secondary.

I know that during the Second World War all Canadians stood and we said we were Canadians. What I have been hearing on this committee is, "We're from Ontario" or "We're from Quebec, we're French Canadians." They do not say where they are born or stand up and say, "I'm a Canadian." The Americans can say, "We're Americans," and I am going to say I am a Canadian. I think our Charter of Rights pretty well puts everything in perspective for all of us, regardless of what our nationality or colour or whatever is.

As far as the aboriginal people go, I do not know enough about any of it to even make an opinion on it. Free trade I know a little bit about. I think the United States was our biggest buyer, and what we did was we allowed them to take over our country by moving out and taking our jobs with them, and of course we will be unemployed.

2030

As for Ontario's role, I moved here a long time ago. I chose Ontario because it was the province of opportunity. Now we are becoming a province of not-so-much opportunity. I think we should all work for one unified country, instead of trying to pull it down and have four or five. I was listening to your programs and listened to other people suggest that we have Canadas. Well, my father, may he rest in peace, died for this country. I think if he saw this today and he could, he would probably roll over in his grave. He fought under the English flag and he cried when we got the Canadian flag that we have now. But because of progress, we do things that have to be done. What else can I say other than I am happy to be here.

Mr Ferguson: Mr London, you suggest that we should put the country first and that everything else should be a secondary consideration. We have heard everything from how we should assist Quebec in leaving as quickly as possible to how we should be doing everything we can to make sure Quebec remains in the family of Confederation. Can you tell the committee how far you would suggest the province of Ontario should go in trying to put the country first and putting everything else secondary? How much give should the province go to succeed in perhaps meeting the requests of the province of Quebec?

Mr London: We do not understand Quebec and I guess Quebec does not understand us, but we do know that in Ontario we ship a lot of stuff down to Quebec. I do not know just exactly what the turnaround is, but we do have a lot of trade with Quebec. I would say that Quebec is part of Canada regardless of whether they say we are separating tomorrow or not. They can say it and they are not going to go anywhere. What are they going to do? Cut it out and take it to France or wherever they want to go?

My suggestion to Ontario would be to work with them. Let's all get together. I know language can be an obstacle. I do not speak French. I am from New Brunswick and I still do not speak French. Most of my people who do speak French in New Brunswick do not know what they are talking about in Quebec anyway. Not all of them. Somebody said "Ah," but it is true. Acadian French is a lot different from Parisian French. That is what I would suggest anyway.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

MARTHA WILLIS

The Chair: Martha Willis. Then I will call after that, Shawn Hamill.

Ms Willis: I am just an ordinary Canadian woman who feels very strongly about this country and the way it is heading. I speak both French and English and I am very fortunate to do so. I really strongly feel that if we lose Quebec, we have lost in essence Canada because this is what makes Canada unique.

I spent two summers in Quebec in a little town, La Pocatière, just a little place of about 6,000 people. It is just ordinary Quebecers. They are just like ordinary Ontarians. We are the same. Their aspirations are the same as ours. I really feel that the media and the politicians are making mountains out of molehills. We all want the same thing.

Unfortunately, there are some people who do not understand that, so what we get are bigoted statements, biased statements. I feel that unfortunately the media are manipulating the ordinary Canadians and the ordinary Quebecers into thinking that this is a great big issue. It is not. Canada is more important.

It reminds me of a family and how you have to compromise and give and take. Right now, we have growing pains. We have a province that reminds me of adolescence. It is throwing little tantrums at times. They want to be heard, they want to be understood, they want to be accepted, they want to be loved, just like in a family. In a family, the rest of the family must make compromises, must be conciliatory, but cannot give them everything for the good of the family. We cannot just let them go away like a runaway teenager.

I think Canada is too important, the family is too important. I would hate to see us come to the point where we just close our minds and say: "Leave. We don't care. We don't want to understand you." I think that is really sad. I would like to see this country stay together and not lose one quarter of the country and one quarter of the population. It is just too important a nation. If they do go, Canada in essence is gone. The family has become totally dysfunctional. I think there is hope and I think ordinary Canadians should be listened to.

The media should not manipulate us. For example, I will bet tomorrow on the news and in the newspapers what will make the news is the man or the gentleman, there could be more than one, in the back who are making statements about the women who are speaking in French. That will make the news, not the reactions of the others who were embarrassed, some of whom spoke back to them. I think ordinary Canadians need to stand up and see what we stand for. But let's not let the media manipulate us. That is all.

[Applause]

The Chair: I think you have had a reaction there, Ms Willis. Ms Witmer.

Mrs Witmer: Thank you very much. I appreciate your presentation. How would you, though, go about not letting the media manipulate us?

Ms Willis: That is a very good question. I find it difficult just watching CNN and watching the Gulf war and watching us being manipulated. I do not have an answer to that. I would just like to see balance on both sides, the truth, not that one person is making bigoted statements like tonight, but that the general populace here was supportive and understanding. She has the right to speak in French, because we have the right to speak in English. That is our country. But you see, if they do that, they are manipulating us. The editors of the newspapers, the producers of the news, they have to make sure it is balanced. That is about all.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Willis. Shawn Hamill?

Interjection: Excuse me, can I say a word?

The Chair: Well—

Interjection: If anybody was talking before, I do not think it is because of French. It was just that we could not understand what was said.

The Chair: Okay. All right, sir. That's fine. All right. We are doing fine. It is okay for people to express themselves. That is fine.

SHAWN HAMILL

The Chair: Mr Hamill, go ahead. Just relax. Go ahead.

Mr Hamill: First of all, I would like to set up where I am coming from with what I want to say. In the past year I have taken a bus as far as Quebec City and I have also taken a bus from the west coast back to Toronto. Quite frankly, I do not think you can really get a feel for Canada unless you have been across the land. To begin with, I have realized that Canada is a very beautiful country. Although I was already proud to be a Canadian, I am damned proud to be a Canadian right now after I have seen what this country consists of. I have not seen the Atlantic provinces yet, but I hope I will soon.

On my bus rides, I have spoken with Canadians and I have detected not only on the bus but from being there, talking to people in bars and wherever you find your average little guy in Canada, that there is one attitude in Ontario that is pretty uniform and the attitude goes in opposite directions as you go west or as you go east. Out west, the western people cannot understand Quebecers. Out east, Quebecers cannot understand western concerns. Both people think that the other has it made in the shade, so to speak.

2040

Myself, I am not a pro-Quebecker and I am not an anti-Quebecker. I always consider myself a mediator. But what I think we are dealing with here is not a language barrier or a cultural barrier or anything like that. I think what we are dealing with here is a matter of priorities. The way I perceive Canada's priorities right now is that it seems, oddly enough, to be the newest person in Canada first.

I hope I am not sounding racist by saying this, but it seems that many people right now feel that the immigrants to Canada are the best-treated people, then perhaps Ontarians are second-best, Anglo-Canadians. It seems a lot

of people think that the natives and the Quebecers are not getting what they deserve. The way I justify saying this is that if you look at who came here first, in my history books it said that the native people were here first and Quebecers were here and English people came in and kicked them out, sending them to small areas.

The natives have their little reserves, not anything close to what they had when we came here, and Quebecers only have Quebec, again not close to what they once had. While I think there is not much you can do about that now, the least I think that we can do, myself included as an English Canadian, is to recognize this fact and say, "Hey, all they're asking is to be compensated for all the things that they have lost." If we would have faced this a long time ago, we would not have had the Oka crisis and we also would not have the Quebec situation right now.

I think something that is a big breakdown in our system is the election system and the media system, as the previous speaker was talking of, where once a point a view is adopted by the media, that is the point of view that generally wins out. As soon as Meech Lake was considered a failure by the media and they started writing stories as such, politicians started jumping on the bandwagon and saying, "Hey, Meech Lake is not as great as it seemed to be." Yet a couple years before, all 10 provinces approved it.

Another example is Mulroney and the 1984 election. The election was a big question on who was going to win until the media jumped on Brian Mulroney's bandwagon, and suddenly he walked away with one of the largest majorities that Canada has ever witnessed. Bob Rae, in the most recent election, was the same thing. The media jumped on his bandwagon and manipulated the people into voting for that side. Perhaps he did deserve a lot of credit for it as well, but it is true that the media do manipulate the people.

Not to just offer problems and not solutions, I feel that the biggest way to overcome the manipulation from the media is through education. Being a marketing person, I know that people generally go to the easiest information to acquire and most usually believe that. The easiest information to acquire right now is the news media. They pick up a newspaper and read what it says and believe it is the truth. If we as Canadians work to educate people, then I think we can get a valid point across rather than being manipulated by the media.

Getting back to the—

The Chair: If you could sum up, Mr Hamill.

Mr Hamill: Okay, I just want to sum up then with the idea of who was here first. A lot of people cannot accept that. They say, "Well, Quebec may have been here first but we are the majority." Let's bring this home to your own living room. If you are sitting in your own living room watching the TV, and three people come home—your wife, your husband or whatever, your two kids—and tell you, "Change the channel, we want to watch something," do you say, "Okay, there are three of you and one of me," or do you say, "No, I was here first"? I do not think there is

one person in this room who has never said, "No, I was here first."

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Hamill.

GISÈLE LATOUR

The Chair: I invite next Gisèle Latour. There is also Paul Latour on our list. I do not know if they are related and wish to make a presentation together or not. No? We will call them separately then.

Mlle Latour : Bonsoir. Monsieur le Président et les membres du comité, j'aimerais d'abord remercier le comité spécial sur l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération de m'avoir accordé ce temps pour exprimer mes rêves pour un meilleur avenir pour l'Ontario et pour le Canada. Cela me fait grand plaisir de voir un gouvernement qui cherche tant à écouter la voix du peuple et j'espère que ma voix vous aidera dans votre tâche.

Je dois en même temps toutefois exprimer mon regret du peu de temps accordé au peuple ontarien pour se préparer pour la venue de comité. Il y a sûrement des voix ontariennes qui désirent tant se faire entendre qui auront été exclues par cette approche.

Je m'appelle Gisèle Latour et je suis une étudiante en physique à l'Université de Waterloo. J'aimerais ce soir partager avec vous deux rêves en particulier que j'ai pour l'Ontario : un Ontario qui donne une reconnaissance égale aux deux langues officielles de notre pays et un Ontario où on pourra trouver une université francophone.

J'ai fait mes études primaires et secondaires en français. Quand j'étais au secondaire, j'espérais faire mes études postsecondaires en français aussi. Quand il est venu le temps de choisir l'université à laquelle je voulais aller, j'ai d'abord regardé les calendriers des universités bilingues de notre province, soit de l'Université d'Ottawa et l'Université Laurentienne. Malheureusement, en sciences, ces universités n'offrent pas grand chose. Il est possible de faire sa première année en français, mais après ça toutes les études se font en anglais, seuls quelques cours à option sont offerts en français.

Alors, j'ai cherché dans les universités du Québec, mais même au Québec l'éducation en sciences en français est très limitée. De plus, je ne voulais pas entrer en exil. J'aime bien ma province et je ne désirais pas la quitter. Pourtant, je suis encore une étudiante en exil. Je suis en exil de la communauté francophone avec laquelle j'ai habité pendant 19 ans. Je me trouve maintenant dans une université anglophone où les seuls cours que je peux suivre en français sont des cours de français. Cela ne m'offre qu'une faible occasion de pratiquer ma langue maternelle.

Je réalise qu'une université francophone en Ontario n'est pas quelque chose qui peut se réaliser d'ici au lendemain et il est très peu probable que cela pourrait même se réaliser avant que j'aie terminé mes études universitaires. Mais je crois qu'il faut viser un tel avenir dès aujourd'hui, car c'est ce que nous bâtissons aujourd'hui qui affectera notre avenir.

Je crois qu'une université francophone en Ontario est une possibilité et je crois que c'est un droit, car les Franco-Ontariens ont des droits. Ils ont des droits tout comme les anglophones en Ontario. En forçant notre jeunesse en exil.

loit dans les communautés anglophones ou dans les autres provinces, nous leur enseignons que le français n'est bon que pour la poésie et que la langue de la réussite, c'est l'anglais.

Je rêve d'un Ontario où il y a une université française et je rêve d'un Ontario où les deux langues officielles de notre pays auront une reconnaissance égale car notre pays est un pays bilingue et je crois que la meilleure façon de bâtir notre unité nationale, c'est si toutes les provinces acceptent la dualité, même les trois cultures qui ont fondées notre nation. Je crois que l'Ontario devrait être à la tête de cette fondation de notre avenir et devrait donc donner une reconnaissance égale aux deux langues officielles de notre pays. Merci pour votre temps.

M. Beer : J'aimerais dire que je pense qu'il faut continuer à rêver parce que si on jette un regard sur les 10 derniers ans ou même 20 ans, on peut vraiment voir des progrès. Je comprends très bien qu'à ce moment, vous voulez avoir votre propre université toute neuve, mais quand même on a fait beaucoup de progrès et c'est pourquoi les rêves sont si importants. Alors, bonne chance. Le fait français dans notre province va s'épanouir.

PAUL LATOUR

M. le Président : J'appelle Paul Latour.

M. Latour : Je vais me permettre d'abord de vous féliciter pour votre endurance à tous. Je reconnais que votre présence ici représente un effort énorme. Je ne sais pas combien de villes en quatre jours ; c'est pas mal.

050

Ms Churley : We do not either.

Mr Latour : You are not sure you are surviving, I can appreciate.

Je vous apporte d'une part une bonne nouvelle et peut-être d'autre part une mauvaise nouvelle. Je suis un Franco-Ontarien de choix. Je suis un vieux néo-Canadien. D'origine je suis Belge, devenu canadien en 1963 après mes cinq ans de résidence au pays.

Je vous parlerai dans les dernières minutes de ma présentation de ma vue du Canada. Mais comme j'observe la vie canadienne, la vie que j'ai faite de la mienne, la vie franco-ontarienne, ça me rappelle beaucoup ce que j'ai vécu en Belgique qui est aussi un pays bilingue. Et de fait, Jules César lui-même avait fait certains commentaires au point de vue des Gauls qui étaient plutôt des gens difficiles, qu'ils fussent Flamands ou Wallons. Mais après 2000 ans l'identité belge a survécu, et en me basant là-dessus je suis convaincu, comme Franco-Ontarien, comme Canadien, que le Canada va survivre. Il va y avoir des douleurs, il va y avoir des difficultés mais ce ne sera pas facile. Ça n'est la bonne nouvelle.

La mauvaise nouvelle, c'est que tant qu'il y aura différentes cultures, tant qu'il y aura de différents points de vue — et on sait que si on devient politicien, la chose qui est garantie est qu'on va être critiqué pour ce qu'on fait ou qu'on essaie de faire — les tensions ne nous quitteront jamais. Il y aura toujours des tensions. C'est le prix qu'on paie pour la richesse qu'on obtient. Et pour ceux et celles qui voudraient dire : « Ah, quand est-ce que le Canada va

devenir un endroit calme » ? j'espère que le Canada ne deviendra jamais un endroit calme parce que chaque communauté est interpellée à inviter l'autre à devenir plus grande. C'est une des raisons pour lesquelles mes parents et moi avons choisi le Canada plutôt que les États-Unis, le fait que c'est un pays bilingue. Et je suis content que nous sommes venus au Canada parce que j'apprécie le fait que dans mon pays, la valeur essentielle est le respect de l'individu, le respect de la personne, le respect de ce que cette personne apporte à notre pays.

Il y a certaines mentions qui ont été faites au sujet de l'éducation. Si nous voulons réduire la tension au Canada, il est important que nous éduquions notre peuple. Ayant travaillé comme volontaire dans la francophonie ontarienne, ayant donné un atelier où on dit aux gens : « Écrivez quelques notes », et on remarque 50% des hommes franco-ontariens incapables d'écrire, comme Franco-Ontarien de choix, je dois vous dire que ça me fait vraiment mal au cœur. Et on se demande pourquoi. Pensons à l'éducation.

En un grand nombre d'années passées, plus de 20 ans passés dans l'éducation au système postsecondaire, j'ai remarqué qu'au courant des années le gouvernement fédéral a abdiqué ses responsabilités et au nom de la balance sheet, « the bottom line » comme on dit en anglais, on réduit ses contributions. Je réalise qu'au courant des années, et je peux penser à nos grands premiers ministres de l'Ontario — je faisais une liste comme je pensais et j'écoutais les autres intervenants — John Robarts, qui avait une vue de l'Ontario que je crois était splendide ; Peter Davidson, qui a eu le courage d'offrir, d'essayer de faire quelque chose pour le pays. Au plan politique c'était très dangereux, mais il a considéré le pays plus important. Le problème c'est les finances, c'est l'économie.

Stephen Lewis, que vous connaissez très bien, était interviewé à la télévision après que le Lac Meech s'est effondré et je crois que ce grand Canadien probablement avait la meilleure compréhension de ce qui se passe au Canada, et la dame qui a parlé comme une Canadienne bilingue je crois a retouché ce que M. Lewis disait : « Le premier ministre a de bonnes idées. Il aime le Canada, il est dévoué au Canada, il veut un Canada en bonne santé mais il ne comprend pas que les politiques économiques démolissent la famille ». Combien de foyers avons-nous vu se détruire, des gens qui se comprenaient et qui s'entendaient.

J'avais apporté un nombre de documents avec moi mais il n'est pas nécessaire de vous rappeler les statistiques, les pertes d'emploi, les cols bleus, le besoin de rééduquer et de réentraîner notre population. On parle d'éducation. J'entendais M^{me} Bathnagar qui parlait du fait que la communauté européenne pense maintenant à trois langues. Je pense que ceci ne passe pas en Europe parce que quand même l'Ontario pour eux est un peu loin, mais nous entendons nous disputer sur deux langues quand l'Europe reconnaît qu'il en faut trois...

En 1958, quand moi je suis venu au Canada, en Belgique, à partir de la troisième année, on devait apprendre l'autre langue jusqu'à la fin des études postsecondaires. On ne pouvait pas l'abandonner et on commençait à apprendre une troisième langue à partir de la huitième année. Je suis

convaincu que nos jeunes Canadiens sont juste aussi intelligents. Alors, voilà quelques-unes de mes idées.

The Chair: Merci. We are going to carry on.

WILLIAM GIVERIN

The Chair: Could I call next William Giverin.

Mr Giverin: I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak before this committee.

My name is William Giverin. I have been a resident of this country for something like 37 years and a citizen for about 34. This country has been very good to me, and I hopefully have been useful and good to this country, my country, our country.

I would like to enforce that point, because all that we hear politically is a lot of things about Canada, and it comes over as though Canada is a place to be used, abused, some place out there that is to be exploited and also to be dissolved, if necessary. This concerns me very much, because I believe what we should have is some sort of council for national unity in Canada, and that Ontario should be the proponent of this general idea. I do not like the idea of a provincial governments partaking and taking the responsibility for the dissolution of Canada. I do not think it is their responsibility. They are elected to look after the province and not over the dissolution of the country. I would point that out to Bob Rae as being his idea of dealing with what is going on in the country at this particular moment.

Past governments here in Ontario are partly to blame for what is going on right now. As a matter of fact, the Robarts and Davis governments sat on their derrières and just looked benevolently at what was happening in Quebec, perhaps tolerated it without really saying anything about it. Previous governments are partly to blame, and it has come to this stage of the game where it has become extremely dangerous for the country.

Even with Quebec now, for instance, it is a provincial government, and the change is from the clerical élites to the entrepreneur élites that we have now in Quebec. I do not believe the average Quebec person wants to see this country fall apart. I am knowledgeable enough about the ordinary French Canadian, and the only problem there is that he tends to look to his élites to determine what the policy will be, and the basic agenda over these last 20 years or so of the Quebec élites is to milk the federal government for all it is worth. That is what has been going on. The federal government has been hijacked or any political party that forms the federal government has been basically hijacked by the idea of that block of French votes. That is really what has been going on.

I see this from a perspective perhaps a little different from the ordinary person. I have a background in political culture both here in Canada and abroad. I think it becomes very difficult to legislate anything to do with culture. As a matter of fact, I think here in Canada that anything in that line we have tried to legislate has really backfired, certainly in the case of Quebec, like Meech Lake; that backfired, the idea of bringing them in.

It is also the effect of the constitutional discussion that took place in the 1980s. We find out the agenda was basically

set by the wise men of Quebec: Pelletier, Marchand and Trudeau, with their sidekicks, Lalonde and also Chrétien. I was over in Britain on a sabbatical year when this was going on, and I saw the British view of this, which was both serious and comic, about this whole discussion that was going on here in Canada—the very idea of a patriated Constitution, which of course was a misnomer; the Constitution was not patriated at all. As a matter of fact, the whole discussion on the Statute of Westminster took exactly 23 minutes in Parliament, of which 20 minutes were a procedural wrangle and three minutes were to approve it. That is precisely what happened in England.

2100

It was also true that at that time they were noting the discussions, especially by the Premier of Alberta and his cronies and some from BC who were talking about it before the Kershaw commission over there, which I listened to every night for about three weeks on Today in Parliament. It was very interesting to find out about all the different varieties of Canadas there could possibly be.

In summary, about early December the Sunday Observer printed a headline that suggested that Canada had become an association of banana republics. This, of course, gave me some concern. I immediately wrote to my MP and he delivered a big package about the whole constitutional matter. At the same time, among these things, who was representing the federal government of Canada but a senior civil servant from the Foreign Office who was more or less backstopping every suggestion that was made. There also there was the bunch of Indians who were parading outside of Buckingham Palace. That was the impression of Canada and it was funny.

The Sunday Observer made some suggestions that were almost prophetic about what is going on now in the present discussion about the status quo, about the two-nation concept and about the condominium concept, which I think you have all heard about.

That is my presentation. It is just a recommendation that the provinces should back away from any sort of constitutional discussion. It is my suggestion to Bob Rae as the Ontario Premier, because all he says by getting into it is actually encouraging Quebec to separate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ANNABEL CATHRALL

The Chair: Can I call in Annabel Cathrall next.

Ms Cathrall: Thank you. My name is Annabel Cathrall. I am a professional engineer and I live in Guelph. I gave Tannis Manikel a copy of the brief I brought, and I hope you have it. Because I am limited to five minutes, I will gallop through it rather fast.

Although the immediate crisis we face is the spectre of Quebec's separation, I submit that it cannot be dealt with effectively in isolation from the urgent needs to redress the grievances of the first nations and to restore popular trust in government as an institution.

The present mood of distrust and cynicism towards governments at all levels has taken decades to develop, but this federal government has accelerated the process by

repeatedly using ultimatum, deadline and force to get a deal at any price. To restore people's trust in government will require more than just another election, a change of incumbents and policies; it will require a change in the relationship between the government and the governed, so that government becomes truly answerable to the people.

Preston Manning strikes a resonant note when he says that once elected, MPs abandon the task of representing their constituents' views in Ottawa and turn instead to selling Ottawa's agenda to the voters. This government has taken the process too far, and now Canadians need to exert some control over their elected representatives; we need to apply some limits to government power. It is not enough to cast ballots once every four or five years and have our views and interests trampled on between elections.

My first proposal is that we need amendments to the Constitution and the Canada Elections Act to provide a recall mechanism so voters in any riding could fire their MP or their MP when he or she fails to represent their interests to the voters' satisfaction.

My second point is that Senate reform should give more power to people, not to provinces. I suggest that the Senate be elected with half the members equally divided among four regions—the Maritimes, central Canada, the West, and the north—and the other half divided equally among three groups of people: the first nations, French Canadians and the rest of us.

Third, the amending formula has received much attention from the Prime Minister because it worked for the people of Canada exactly as it was supposed to do and that it did not suit his style of government by threat, ultimatum and the rolling of dice. Any proposed amendment to the fundamental law of this country should be subjected to close and careful scrutiny, not rushed through like a sale at auction. I urge the government of Ontario to block any attempt to alter the time allowed for ratification of amendments to the Constitution.

Fourth, after watching the Meech Lake fiasco I do not want to leave the Constitution in the hands of governments only. Perhaps an additional requirement for ratification of amendments should be a popular referendum, requiring two-thirds majority in each region.

Fifth, the Charter of Rights should be extended and renamed the Charter of Rights, Responsibilities and Duties. We have focused on rights for a decade to such an extent that it has created some distortions. For example, in the area of child welfare, severely disturbed children cannot be treated without their consent even if suicidal. Juggling rights alone will not straighten out these anomalies. We need to balance our rights with our responsibilities and duties towards one another and the natural environment.

Turning to Quebec, in the run-up to the Meech Lake fiasco the Prime Minister told Quebecers that rejection of Meech meant rejection of Quebec. They believed him and that is part of the problem that Canada faces today. But it is not true. Many, many of us opposed Meech Lake for reasons that had little or nothing to do with Quebec.

We opposed giving any province a veto over the creation of new provinces, over aboriginal self-government and changes to national institutions. We opposed the transfer

of spending power to the provinces on such a massive scale as to effectively balkanize all of Canada. It seems necessary, though far from sufficient, that the government of Ontario articulate clearly to Quebecers that they were lied to and that they were not rejected with Meech. Now the Prime Minister seems set to repackage the worst features of Meech and try again to ram them down our throats.

I do not believe this country can survive as a federation if its east-west ties are weakened further while its north-south ties are strengthened by yet another free trade deal. I am not even sure it can survive the first one for long if economic stresses get worse.

Transfers of power to provincial governments, which tend to haggle like horse traders as it is now, would only make it easier for the US and other outside investors to play one off against another, gradually reducing us all to the lowest common denominator.

I urge the government of Ontario to oppose transfers of power to provincial governments that would weaken our national programs such as medicare and regional industrial expansion and to oppose free trade with Mexico.

Please keep in mind that there is much more to a nation and its Constitution than optimizing arrangements for making money.

There are some other things that I would like to mention that have come out of the present crisis in the Gulf. According to Toronto lawyer Marlys Edwardh, Canadian law provides no protection from combat duty for conscientious objectors. In the US it is acceptable to argue that conscience can be awakened by the war the soldier is being asked to fight, so even in an all-volunteer army this protection may be required.

I urge the government of Ontario to press for protection from combat for conscientious objectors. The decision to commit Canadian troops to fight in the war without a formal declaration can be made, and in the case of the Gulf war was made, by the federal cabinet alone. No prior approval by Parliament was required. The federal government cannot spend money without the approval of Parliament but it can spend lives.

I think it is high time Canadians were asked if this situation is acceptable to them and if not how and by whom they would like a decision to go to war to be made. I thank you for listening to me.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Paul Johnson? After Mr Johnson, I will call Rodney Pinkney next. Mr Johnson, go ahead.

2110

PAUL JOHNSON

Mr Johnson: I have been watching on TV. I saw Brian Dymond speak in Collingwood on the parliamentary channel and he was explaining about the Robarts school and the situation there and the mainstreaming that is going on in the school in Milton. I felt that was a very sad situation and I hope that this committee can do something about it.

Now talking about the interpreter situation, I live in the Waterloo region and I have lived here for many years. The

problem here is that we have one interpreter for the whole region and we find that very frustrating. One interpreter: Can you imagine? We need interpreters. We need more than one person. In Toronto they have about five interpreters, but I hear that number is becoming smaller and smaller as well. There is something that needs to be done, and that is it.

RODNEY PINKNEY

Mr Pinkney: Just so that you will have an idea of my roots, although I am speaking for myself, I think there are a lot of people in this country who probably have similar roots to mine, especially in this area.

We have been in this country about 150 years. I was in the Second World War on a frigate. My father was in the trenches in the First World War. If anybody does not have the guts to stand up for their country, let them go somewhere else. That is enough of that.

We have some real problems in this country and everybody is kind of supportive of motherhood, but if you look at what has happened to our economic situation in this country today, what has happened in the last 20 or 25 years is that by any standard we are bankrupt. Why are we bankrupt? I think we have been just trying to be too good to too many people and we are really not able to afford to do it.

God knows, I came up through the Depression. I walked the railroads to get coal so that it would supplement the wood in the winter. I started work when I was 12 every night after school and weekends. I know what it is to work to get something and I am darn sure that I am not really very sympathetic for a lot of these people who get their daily dole one way or another and are really not prepared to work.

I am sympathetic and I help as many people as I can, but I want other people to hold a little bit of their own end up. I realize that as the country gets bigger, it is very, very difficult to arrange programs, but the bottom line is that we are in a real world, that we have to compete with the rest of the world in the goods we manufacture, that we have to have our costs at that same level no matter how you like it, that we have to have wages that are competitive, and I certainly think we have the talent to produce if we can get our costs in line.

Another thing: I sent my young boy to French school for a few years. I have worked for a short time in Quebec, I have a number of friends in Quebec. I sure as heck am a Canadian, but I think we have to face the fact of what is here today, not really what we would like to have here today because we would all like to have everything. I think we have to do the most we can for the most people we can, but it has to be within what we can afford or else we are all going down the drain, and that is what happened in Sweden.

As far as our association with Quebec is concerned, I think it is like a marriage. Most of us, I think, in this country would like to keep it. I think we might say the average person who lives in Quebec would like to keep it. But if you have a group that has control and it does not want to have it, well, it is not a very happy home. You probably would find that you are both better off to have

some kind of an association, but a fairly distant association to start with.

I think you have more chance of bringing Quebec back on better terms, or working with it, if you get away from the haggling and the nitty and all the small little junk that goes on. If you are going to keep that you are just going to be continually fighting. Have some major cuts, let them look after all their own economics, their own cultures.

When I was a kid at school, half the community was Italian and the other half was farm families which were mostly of Nordic origination. We did not even know the difference between one another as far as the way we dealt with each other was concerned. It was never discussed. There was never a problem. There was never a fight over anything. As soon as you start saying, "You are this and somebody else is that," and, "Somebody else does this and somebody else does that," and, "I do not like your religion and all this nonsense," then that is where you get the fighting. If they had stopped all this ruddy multiculturalism and come over here to be Canadians like my people did, I think we would have been an awful lot better off.

If Quebec has to separate—

The Chair: Mr Pinkney, if you could sum up, please.

Mr Pinkney: Pardon?

The Chair: If you could sum up, please.

Mr Pinkney: Okay. The bottom line is we cannot afford to go on the way we are. We are going to have to, I think, cut the cord. I think we are going to have to let the French look after Quebec, and English speaking look after the rest of it, and try to work together in that fashion. We just cannot afford to go on the way we have been.

CLAUDE CHARPENTIER

The Chair: Could I call next Claude Charpentier, and following that, Ernie Anderson.

M. Claude Charpentier : Monsieur le Président, j'aimerais m'adresser à vous en français.

Monsieur le Président, membres de la commission, je vous remercie pour cette occasion qui m'est offerte pour vous adresser la parole. Je viens vous parler à titre individuel. Je suis originaire du Québec mais depuis l'âge de six ans je demeure en Ontario. Je suis donc Franco-Ontarien. À l'exception de trois ans où j'ai demeuré à Vanier dans la banlieue d'Ottawa, Eastview à ce moment-là, c'est toujours dans le sud de l'Ontario que j'ai vécu.

J'ai donc appris à parler l'anglais lorsque j'étais très jeune et j'ai également appris qu'il fallait faire toutes sortes d'efforts pour ne pas perdre mon français. Cette lutte quotidienne pour survivre en tant que francophone se continue car j'estime très important de transmettre à mes enfants l'héritage de la langue et de la culture françaises héritées de mes parents.

La mise sur pied de cette commission est une preuve des plus tangibles de l'état critique dans laquelle se trouve notre pays. Je me demande en toute sincérité si d'ici quelques générations il sera encore possible pour ceux qui nous succéderont de fredonner le début de notre hymne national, «Ô Canada, terre de nos aïeux».

Ceci m'amène à traiter de la question numéro 6 : quel est l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada ? J'aurais peut-être aimé voir une question : «quel est le rôle de la francophonie hors Québec dans ce Canada» ? Trop de gens peu éclairés sont prêts à dire qu'ils s'en fichent si le Québec se sépare ou encore, qu'il est temps que le Québec se sépare. D'autres encore moins éclairés s'empressent d'ajouter qu'il n'y aura aucune raison pour continuer à offrir des services aux francophones hors Québec une fois que la séparation du Québec sera fait accompli. Monsieur le Président, ces conclusions simplistes ne font qu'accentuer la gravité du problème.

Si le Québec venait à se séparer, il n'y aurait pas d'espace vide entre l'Est et l'Ouest permettant un rapprochement physique avec l'Ontario, des Prairies d'une part et les Maritimes de l'autre. Des personnes pouvant s'exprimer dans les deux langues seraient encore nécessaires pour assurer une communication efficace avec le Québec et les autres pays aussi de notre monde global. Toutefois, je suis de l'avis que si le Québec se sépare du Canada — et je ne le souhaite pas du tout — c'est peut-être non seulement la fin du Canada comme nous le connaissons aujourd'hui, mais peut-être la fin du Canada, point. Il est impossible, elon moi, qu'une tranche si importante de notre population, de nos industries et de notre commerce se retirent du Canada sans qu'il y ait des répercussions graves, surtout lorsque cette partie du Canada est située juste à côté de l'Ontario, isolant ainsi les provinces Maritimes. Je ne suis pas le premier à poser la question, à savoir si les Maritimes, déjà économiquement faibles, rejoindraient les États-Unis.

Plusieurs disent qu'il ne faut pas que le Québec mène le pays par le bout du nez. Par contre, j'aimerais bien que quelqu'un m'explique de quelle partie de l'anatomie humaine il s'agit lorsqu'une province ne représentant que 2,2% de la population et, par dessus le marché, étant située à l'extrémité de notre pays, contribue au sabotage de la ratification de l'accord de Lac Meech. Si on est de l'avis qu'il s'agit bien de deux provinces qui n'ont pas ratifié l'accord, il s'agit d'environ 6,5% de la population totale du Canada, si on exclue bien sûr les deux Territoires, qui n'étaient pas représentées aux assises. Deux provinces représentant 6,5% de la population empêchent une province représentant un des deux peuples fondateurs et environ 5% de la population de faire partie de cette nouvelle constitution.

Si ce pourcentage est assez important, la population franco-ontarienne est assez importante pour être reconnue de façon officielle. Monsieur le Président, je crois que l'Ontario a un rôle majeur à jouer car l'Ontario a toujours joué un rôle d'une importance capitale. Il suffit de se rappeler la fameuse Conférence de demain qu'avait organisée il y a quelques années l'honorable John Roberts, ancien premier ministre de cette province. Il s'agissait lors du début d'une série de consultations qui par la suite ont réussi à rapprocher des provinces.

Je suggère que l'Ontario pourrait renouveler cette approche. Il est peut-être temps que les neuf autres provinces se concertent et s'entendent pour dire ce qu'elles veulent.

Le Québec de son côté va se prononcer très prochainement par l'entremise de la commission Bélanger-Campeau.

Quant aux rôles du français ou de l'anglais au Canada, il y a un statut officiel, bien sûr. Par contre, le Commissaire aux langues officielles nous rappelle souvent les déficiences qui existent en réalité. On veut souvent en Ontario rattacher des droits des Franco-Ontariens à ceux de la minorité anglophone au Québec. Je serai très fier de jouir des droits dont jouissent les anglophones au Québec. Ils sont très bien desservis par Sir George Williams, Concordia, McGill ainsi que toute la gamme d'institutions. J'ajoute que d'énormes progrès ont été réalisés en Ontario. Je ne pense pas qu'il faille s'arrêter là. Je respecte énormément les groupes qui veulent conserver leur langue, leur culture, que ce soit des Italiens, des Ukrainiens et bien sûr les autochtones qui ont une place spéciale au Canada. Mais je pense qu'il ne faudrait pas mêler les cartes. On ne peut pas donner à tous avant de donner aux peuples fondateurs ce qui leur revient.

Je vais m'arrêter là. Il y a d'autres peut-être qui voudraient présenter.

M. le Président : Oui, merci Monsieur Charpentier.

ERNIE ANDERSON

The Chair: Could I call in next Ernie Anderson, and following that, I will call Junius Lockhart.

Mr Anderson: I am not too good at this, but I am very much concerned about Quebec and I think we should try and keep them within our Confederation. I know Quebec wants French and I do not blame them and I think we should let them have French inside and outside of the buildings or on their street signs or whatever, for the rest of us can learn to speak French, but if they go bilingual, what is the use of learning French if we can go through there and talk English and get by on it? So eventually the French would die out, of course.

I think if they would stay with us and we guarantee them to keep their language—I do not want to buy them, though, and I do not want to try to shanghai them into being Canadian. If they insist on going their own way, I say let them go. The only thing is, we will pick up the national debt and count the noses or heads and then, for six million or whatever they have got and the rest of us have got 18 million, just divide it up and then let them go their own way if they insist on it. It is one of those things where I hope we can certainly settle this argument and get them back in there, but I do not want them to be for ever saying, "If I don't get this, I'm going to back out." I want them to come in, live with us and love us all and be co-operative.

I think the public school systems are educating people in French now, are they not? In my time, they were not teaching French. I often wish I had taken the French to understand them. I know one time I was in the Ford Hotel in Toronto and I sat down on the bench waiting for a bus and there was an old fellow who sat down beside me. He was a school inspector in, I guess, a French school. He said they used the French language on documents of peace or whatever, because the one word meant what it said and in English sometimes you get two meanings for the one word.

It is one of those things. It should be of benefit to us to learn both languages and use them both. I think if a person learns both his mother language and French in Ontario here, even if he is unemployed and on welfare, he should get one cent an hour more for being bilingual. If you want to take it a little further, if you have three languages, maybe two cents, and so on.

But it is one of those things. Why stop? I think, right now, we should start to learn Japanese and Chinese for that is where our next—I am pretty seriously worrying about the future because Europe is getting kind of peaceful now, except for the squabble over in Arabia and Kuwait. If they all get too peaceful, what are we going to have for work? Who is going to have work? What are you going to work at? Up until now, it has always been making guns, you know. A lot of the things went into making guns. But after they get peace, what are they going to make? Everybody makes cars? Who is going to buy them? Like I told one guy, they have robots making parts for cars, but how many cars do the robots buy?

Everybody has got to live, that is the first thing we have got to do in this world. It does not matter who you are. We have got to have something to eat and a place to sleep. If you cannot get that, government cannot give it to you. Everybody has got to work for it. So I think we could try to get together, keep Quebec within the fold, but I do not want to buy them. I do not want to have to buy them, and every five or six years they want this or they are going to separate. I want them to stay with us.

I am 72, and I have been here and heard this Quebec business for quite a long time and I do not know too much. I have not been around this country as much as half of you have. But just for the little bit I have seen and the bit I see on TV, I love it and I think we had better try and keep it and make it function. If nothing else, if Quebec decided to go, we could go to the United States and that would make this big country one, but then what would happen to Quebec? She would be like the moon on the earth. There would be a big brown ball of light maybe, and craters and a few pinnacles, but there would not be much there. Her people would pack up and leave. They want to go where the work is and where the money is.

The Chair: Mr Anderson, if you could sum up.

Mr Anderson: I would just say, it is one of those things. Try and keep it together. If nothing else, it will keep North America a little bit two societies, American and Canadian.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

2130

JUNIUS LOCKHART

The Chair: I call Junius Lockhart and following that, I will call Joanne Cripps.

Mr Lockhart: Only one of you gentlemen knows me and I wish to tell you that I do not agree with anything that is going on tonight.

Let me tell you that a few years ago, in the university, we had a speaker come up from the States, from Washington, he was, and we had martial law here at one time. All of

you knew it, although you were just youngsters; you knew it when that happened. The joke of that was that I worried out of him the fact that when we declared martial law, the United States threw brigades of the army around Quebec on its side of Quebec, and was all ready for invasion. Nobody heard about it.

I wish you French-speaking people would get it through your heads that it is not just English Canada that—

The Chair: Sir, you are going to have to speak into the microphone, otherwise we are going to lose you over the air.

Mr Lockhart: I was speaking to them at that time.

The Chair: I understand that.

Mr Lockhart: I am sorry to say that all through the—I want a strong Canada from beginning to end. I have been in Quebec. I had a very good friend who took me there and took me all through it and I found that they speak lovely English at the border in the summertime. That is where they have the American dollars coming in. They speak good English then, but in the wintertime, they forget it they do not need it.

The lady had two daughters. She sent them both to Quebec to a convent school and they spoke French. That is where it came in. They learned French. Now, we could do that with our children too if we thought that it was needed. I do not think it is. As far as Quebec is concerned, it can go out of Canada whenever it wants. The law says that it can. There is no fuss or anything about that. They can go out and we cannot stop them, no matter what we do. The lady is there.

We are in a bind here in Ontario. We are losing our industries left and right. We have no place in the west to go, because the west is having difficulties itself. We are now trapped and Bob Rae has got the whole mess in his hands, left by the former governments. We have no hope in that, unless we can come up with a solid foundation that will give the people work.

Existing on charity is absolutely useless. I have seen that. Since 1970, I have been able to go around the city and Toronto and talk to thousands of people. I have no trouble in talking to them. I find that they are all of a similar opinion. As far as Quebec is concerned, they do not want to hear about it. If they are going to go, they are going to go, and we cannot stop them. That is all I have to say gentlemen.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

JOANNE CRIPPS

The Chair: Joanne Cripps.

Ms Cripps: Can you see me all right, Gary? Thank you.

Hello, everyone. My name, as you know, is Joanne Cripps and I was born deaf. I went through an oral program, even though I was profoundly deaf, and I was trained to basically use my speech, to use spoken English. These are the issues I want to speak to.

I think that the rights of deaf individuals, deaf culture etc, need to be included in our Constitution. I think that

problems that we have had in the past with the oral philosophy of educating deaf children, etc, need to be eliminated. I think that that is why we need to include the rights of deaf people and American sign language, ASL, and deaf culture in the Constitution. We have to have rights for deaf children. Our current laws are very weak.

I am not sure if you have heard of cochlear implants, but there was recently a child by the age of two who had a cochlear implant. The child did not make the decision to have the implant itself. That is an awful thing to subject them to. Where are the rights of that child? The parents often hear information which is not entirely accurate. They spend an awful lot of money. I think it was \$3,000 for this child. What we need to do is improve education of parents so that they will know what they are getting themselves into. I feel really sorry for these parents and I also feel very sorry for the children.

I would like to see boards of education have the IPRC process. I think the parents need to be involved in that process. In fact, no deaf adults are involved in the IPRC process, and deaf children are put into mainstream programs without getting all the information that they really need. There is no exposure to deaf culture, no exposure to ASL. It is a terrible system. They have no authority to do that to our deaf children, to place them in these programs without consulting those who have the expertise. They need to get people who have experience in deafness to assist them when they are deciding on the placement of these children.

Currently the provincial schools for the deaf have very limited restrictions in terms of the degree of deafness that a child must have before being allowed to enter the schools for the deaf. It is a certain dB loss. But what happens to the children who are hard of hearing? They are looking at a medical model, and instead of thinking the child needs to be exposed to both spoken English and ASL and deaf culture, they are not giving these children the opportunity to be exposed to both avenues. These children are only being exposed to an oral method when they could benefit from both.

As a recent example, I had an ASL class, and there is an individual who teaches deaf children here and she is in my class. The kids are around six or seven years of age. It is an oral method and they are not allowed to sign at all. Their hands are slapped if they try to use gestures or signs, and I do not know how they can stand to do that. I think there is an inequality here. Children have a right to language. Just as our hearing children have a right to use spoken language, so do our deaf children—how to write, use sign language—and that needs to be incorporated into the curriculum.

Our schools should be more open to any deaf students who wish to attend. We need to open them up. They should not be limited to those individuals who live within the geographical boundaries. Often parents approach me and they say they are very frustrated because their child is hard of hearing but the child cannot attend a residential school for the deaf. Where are the parents' rights here?

2140

In summary, my points are that ASL and deaf culture should be included in our Constitution. Cochlear implants should be outlawed. They should not be allowed. These things should not be allowed to happen without the parents having more information and more education. We need more deaf people involved in the administration of schools for the deaf. We need improved interpreting services.

As I need to really tell you, our experience is something that we need to give to you. We are tired of being put down by you and taken advantage of. Look at us. We are the same as you are. We need you to look at us as equals and we want you to learn from us and take your lead from us to improve the education of deaf children for our future so that they can be better deaf Canadians. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Cripps.

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO FEDERATION OF STUDENTS

The Chair: I call next Kim Speers and Stefan Fritz from the federation of students at Waterloo University. Are they here? We should mention that there are people who are following the proceedings in another room because of the overflow here. We are obviously pleased that so many people have chosen to come out this evening here in the Kitchener-Waterloo area. Good evening.

Ms Speers: Good evening. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce those who will be speaking on behalf of the students at the University of Waterloo. To my right is Scott Murray, who is on the board of directors of the federation of students, and on my left Stefan Fritz. He is the president of the United Nations club within the federation of students at the University of Waterloo. My name is Kim Speers. I am vice-president of university affairs of the federation of students as well as women's commissioner for the Ontario Federation of Students.

We are going to try to speak on behalf of the students at University of Waterloo. As you can realize just after hearing everybody tonight, there are many diverse views on this but we will try our best. The presentation will be divided into two segments. First, we will be discussing the need for a strong central government in respect to post-secondary education. The second part of our presentation will concentrate on the issue of Canada's future in a broader context.

Throughout history, post-secondary education has not been given the importance and credence that it deserves by the federal and provincial governments. Post-secondary education is far more than the exercise of federal spending powers. It goes to the heart of the factors that bind Canada together as a country. In a country as vast and diverse as ours, nationhood is often a tenuous proposition. What better place to start nation-building than in our schools, our universities and colleges, and educational programs which take place outside of our institutions?

A strong central government must be the force to ensure that we are economically and socially a strong nation, at the same time respecting regional and cultural diversity. It was mentioned previously that post-secondary education is far more than the exercise of federal spending powers.

However, the federation of students believes both the federal and provincial financial contributions to the educational sector have not kept pace with this often-stated commitment to the value of post-secondary education.

Students across the country continue to face at an increasingly disturbing rate an erosion of the quality of education at universities and colleges. Lecture halls remain overcrowded, libraries are stripped down, laboratories are woefully ill equipped and the student-faculty ratios continue to rise beyond already unacceptable levels. Chronic underfunding has produced a second-class university system in Canada, one that has fallen alarmingly behind international standards.

The possible effects of a further decentralized concept of Canada in respect to education is frightening. Already we experience an irregularity of each province's financial commitment to post-secondary education. There must exist a more centralized educational structure in order that the levels of funding to universities and colleges are dispersed on an equal basis. Because of the inconsistencies which exist in the funding policies of the provinces, it has placed post-secondary institutions in the position of having to offer a diminished quality of education to a greater number of students. How can one have a unified country if one does not have a unified system due to irregular funding patterns in the provinces?

Canada's ability to compete with other leading world economies can only happen if Canada realizes that investing in education is an investment in Canada's future. The changing global marketplace demands an increasingly significant role for Canada's post-secondary education system. Federal and provincial government alike have defined the major contribution that universities and colleges make in maintaining Canada's competitive position in today's global economy and the vital role they play in the development of highly skilled human resources. In respect to securing our future in the international economy, the answer is simple: Educate the population and provide funding to operate in an effective manner. Spending on education and research and development are investments in the future. They may require sacrifices now, but if we are not forward-looking the sacrifices which will come later will be more painful and less productive.

In the long run, a more highly educated populace, a training system which operates with efficiency, sensitivity and responsiveness to labour market needs, and increased research and development will only increase the wealth of our country and the opportunity for further social development. With respect to social development and to achieving a more receptive, caring and accessible society, Canada's commitment to eliminating all forms of discrimination should have its roots in the current education system. The citizens of Canada must unlearn racism, sexism, agism and the many other ill-found forms of discrimination which run rampant in Canadian society.

Truly equal accessibility is essential if every individual is to have full opportunity to participate in life and to develop her or his potential in Canadian society. This statement of belief must come forth from the federal government and must carry weight in every university and

college in Canada. Funding of women's studies and native studies programs must increase in order to educate the public on these important issues, and more funding should go towards the grant and loan programs in order to make universities and colleges accessible to all Canadians.

Funding must increase and federal policies must be developed and acted upon immediately. How can we create a society which would give equal opportunity to all when the provincial government randomly provides funding to certain programs or fails to provide funding for programs to increase awareness and opportunity? To develop federal policies with respect to accessibility would benefit all Canadians, not just students. We must work together as a nation to combat the ills in society. What better place than our education system.

Canada is at a crossroads and we have to choose. The choice is between a rapidly deteriorating post-secondary education system due to a lack of funding and ineffective policies, and should we move to a more decentralized nation; or do we choose a stronger federal role in post-secondary education, ensuring an accessible and effective education for those who attend a university or college in Canada to ensure Canada's ability to compete with other nations in the world? Canada cannot afford to waste the potential of a great many of its citizens. The human needs of the population must take highest priority.

As stated previously, and I cannot emphasize this point enough, a strong central government must be the force to ensure that we are economically and socially a strong nation, at the same time respecting regional and cultural diversity. We must stay together in order for all of us to survive. Thank you. Now Stefan.

Mr Fritz: Good evening. I believe one of the most forgotten questions regarding Canada in forums like these is what this nation has overcome to arrive at where it is now. This question puts the hurdles we face today into a clearer perspective, because only then can we see how Canada has developed over time.

Most fundamentally, Canada and Canadians have overcome physiographic boundaries inconceivable to virtually all other nations. Immense distances have also been overcome, leading Canada to the forefront of global telecommunications. Strong cultural differences have also been addressed, to the point where Canada has for the most part developed an enviable system for meeting the needs of its citizens. This last point is perhaps Canada's greatest single strength, namely, its ability to conciliate, to juggle the needs and the wants of most of its citizens.

Now we possibly stand before the largest stepping stone which must be overcome before we as Canadians can move into a secure future. In this respect several questions must be answered. First, what underlying value has provided Canada's basis? This, I would argue, is its ability to conciliate between needs. Second, one must look at some of these needs, especially those central to the question of Canadian unity. Finally, it is important within the context of this forum to outline Ontario's role within Canada. In focusing on these points, I hope to briefly address those questions you asked in the committee booklet.

150

Canada is often criticized by its own citizens. It is labelled as a nation that waffles on important issues. However, I feel Canada has a tremendous ability to conciliate and mediate. In other words, its ability in general to meet the needs of its people is strong. This is seen foremost in our advanced health care system, relatively high average standard of living and Canada's international role as a reliable and well-respected middle power.

We now must develop a system which builds upon these strengths and answers those issues not completely answered to date, for example, the first nations and the Constitution, just to mention two. In order to address these issues we need, first of all, a strong central political structure in tune with all of Canada, which is able to promote Canada as a single nation; second, we need institutionalized participation by the first nations within the Canadian political system; and third, a strong voice within the federal structure for the provinces and the territories.

The provinces and territories have all contributed greatly to Canada's development and growth. At the same time, each province and territory has great needs and these needs vary from one to the next. In order to prevent the alienation of any one region, broader regional participation must be encouraged at the federal level. It is our group's position that provincial and territorial participation must be institutionalized within a new federal structure, in, for example, a Senate that is elected and has equal representation from all provinces and territories. Naturally, the logistics of this would still have to be worked out.

This federal structure must also give Canada's first nations a special status. This status should be realized in giving these peoples clout within the Senate equal to that of a province. Special attention must also be given to the French language within Canada; most definitely this includes putting it on the same footing as English. This would entail that French, as one of Canada's official languages, must be accessible to the larger part of the Canadian population, especially through education. Certainly people cannot be legislated into learning another language, and that would be undesirable, but on the whole French must be recognized as a key component of Canada's character, its development and not least of all its competitiveness and strength within the international community. Special consideration must be given in this regard to the maintenance and preservation of French, especially in Quebec, as it is the institutionalized centre of Canada's francophone culture.

Within the context of this forum it is important also to briefly outline how Ontario fits into the Canadian picture. Ontario's role, which cannot be understated, should be to recognize and support the notion that all regions must be given equal economic and political opportunities. In recognizing that Ontario benefits from a single and strong Canada, it is therefore in our own interest as citizens of Ontario to enhance efforts promoting unity. In short, by sharing Ontario's economic and political strength, ultimately the commonwealth will be increased.

The Canada of the future must be a nation based on mutual respect between the provinces, territories and first

nations. By relying on those underlying reasons which has made Canada what it is today, and by constructively addressing the hurdles that face us today, Canada will certainly grow and develop into a nation both strong within and internationally. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Fritz. We will move on.

I want to check, because time is getting close to 10 and I want to make sure we have given anyone who is here representing organizations or groups an opportunity to speak.

SOUTH WESTERN REGION LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA (ONTARIO)

The Chair: I understand Paul Kellam is representing an organization. Mr Kellam, would you come forward?

Mr Kellam: Good evening. My name is Paul Kellam. I am president of the South Western Region of the Liberal Party of Canada (Ontario), the association of 32 federal riding associations from Niagara to Bruce to Windsor.

I am speaking here tonight because we are facing a constitutional crisis which may well result in the breakup of Canada. Although the political role I play is at a federal level, I am of the opinion that the actions of the Ontario government will be critical to the outcome of the national debate and negotiations that are likely to take place. It is my hope that co-operation can occur among the provincial parties to form a unified Ontario approach, so I direct my comments to all members of the committee regardless of their political affiliation.

I would like to discuss the political environment in which this crisis has developed, the difficulties facing some of the current players, the role of different levels of government in Canada and the outlook of Ontarians. At the outset, I will state my hope that all Canadians will co-operate in building a single country, but it would be irresponsible not to think and plan for the possibility that Quebec will decide to separate. Therefore, many of my comments will also be directed towards that possibility.

For the three years leading up to 23 June 1990, Brian Mulroney and other senior federal ministers consistently and repeatedly told Quebecers that a rejection of the Meech Lake accord was a rejection of Quebec by the rest of Canada. It is my opinion that this is the primary reason we face as severe a crisis as we do today. Quebecers feel rejected and now have little interest in trying to reform Canada to fit their dreams. To most English Canadians, Robert Bourassa looks like a separatist. The Allaire report proposes an emasculated federal government left primarily with the privilege of transferring money to Quebec and managing the debt. None of you should doubt that this is the harsh reality of how the Quebec government is viewed.

Quebec's sign law has not been forgotten. The thought that rights enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom can be taken away by a provincial government is unacceptable to many English Canadians. When they saw the Quebec government ban English signs in Quebec, they felt the English minority was being attacked. I would say to you that any package of changes to the Constitution must include the abolition of the "notwithstanding" clause,

because rights are rights and must be upheld in every jurisdiction.

Meech Lake was described as meeting Quebec's five demands. Demands are not things made by people interested in co-operation or showing goodwill; they are made by extortionists. It is no wonder that English Canadians felt little regret at the defeat of the accord. It was not even clear that meeting the demands would permanently satisfy Quebec. That sense has been solidified by the appearance of more drastic demands in the Allaire report and the expected recommendations of the Bélanger-Campeau commission.

So far, I have concentrated on the problems based in Quebec, but they are not the only problems you will face. The accord died because aboriginal Canadians opposed it, the discontent in western Canada that is turning into support for Preston Manning's Reform Party is based on a feeling that western concerns are being ignored, and northern representatives feel that their future is being decided solely by southerners. They were left out of the Meech Lake negotiations. They must not be left out this time.

If no common understanding can be reached and we arrive at the point of negotiating the separation of Quebec, then the question of who negotiates for Canada must be answered. Clearly it cannot be a federal government that is in power because of seats won in Quebec, nor can a Quebecker lead negotiations on behalf of the rest of Canada. Our current federal government has both of these problems. If this continues to be the case, the other provincial governments may be the only elected bodies with sufficient electoral credibility to fill the gap. I urge you to keep this in mind as you help to form Ontario's position, for stands the provincial government takes early in the process will affect its ability to negotiate later. If a concession is offered in the first round, retracting it later will be almost impossible.

Canada is a relatively new country: Newfoundland joined in 1949; Alberta and Saskatchewan were created at the turn of the century. At the time of Confederation Quebec was considerably smaller than it is today. This country has been built by co-operating in a common effort to make a nation of tolerance and prosperity, with provinces created when appropriate, and boundaries redrawn to meet changing circumstances.

2200

Our federal government has helped to develop remote areas with transportation and communication links, establishing the infrastructure of new communities. Social programs are provided across Canada, such as the Canada pension plan and unemployment insurance. There are obvious international roles for a federal government in areas such as defence, diplomacy, immigration and negotiations on trade, the environment, fishing and aviation.

Each area of government activity, in terms of standards, delivery and funding, will likely have to be put on the discussion table. It is time to take a fresh look at the responsibilities of each level of government and where appropriate, redistribute them. This does not inherently imply decentralization or centralization, and so should not be viewed as a threat to any level of government.

It is said that Ontarians are the only Canadians who think of themselves as Canadians first and residents of their particular province or region second. The reasons usually given centre on the economic power of Ontario and how much that determines what the country can afford to do. The effect is that Ontarians are willing to share that wealth and political power to help build a country where everyone has a fair living and equal opportunity.

Transfer payments to poorer provinces are funded by Ontarians, Albertans and British Columbians because of this spirit of generosity. But when those people feel they are being taken advantage of, the willingness disappears. This is exactly the reaction evoked by proposals like those in the Allaire report. One cannot take the advantages of Confederation without being willing to subscribe to common principles.

One third of Canadians reside in Ontario. Proposals of an elected Senate are bound to arise. The one point I would like to make on this is that a Senate with an equal number of seats from each province would be very hard for many Ontarians to accept. Ontarians are willing to share power, even willing to exercise less than their proportional share, but it is simply unreasonable for a province with fewer residents than Kitchener to have as much power as all of this province. A more acceptable solution right now may be equal representation for four or five regions, but whatever is proposed should recognize the possibility of significant changes in the distribution of population across the country and therefore provide a mechanism for the reallocation of seats or the updating of definitions of regions.

As the structure of government in our country is debated, I would urge you to use the following three criteria when considering an area of responsibility: standards, delivery and funding.

On standards: Will it seem reasonable to Canadians to have different standards for different provinces? I believe, for example, that environmental standards should be the sole jurisdiction of the federal government, for it will seem ridiculous to Canadians if air pollution standards were lower in Lloydminster, Alberta, than in Lloydminster, Saskatchewan.

On delivery: Does provision of the service cross provincial boundaries or is it of a sufficiently local nature that a provincial or even municipal government may be able to provide it more efficiently? Clearly, services such as defence, diplomatic representation and coastal search and rescue are better suited to a national government than snow plowing and school construction.

On funding: Is a service sufficiently close to the core of our values that we feel all Canadians have a right to services independent of the financial ability of their province? Is the service of benefit to all of Canada but by chance located in one province? In both these cases, it is clear that funding should be provided by the federal government.

As elected politicians you all face the problem of a cynical electorate. When a provincial government goes to the negotiating table, the public suspects that it is after more power and very unlikely to act in the national interest. Canada needs representatives who will take a broader view, who will repudiate the approach of "give the government I run all the power," and instead seek a co-operative,

constructive agreement that addresses all of the problems facing our country. When it is appropriate, have the courage to point out that a power currently in provincial hands belongs at the federal level, or that another region is facing problems because of actions taken for or in Ontario. It can only help your credibility.

Even if a consensus among politicians can be found, the whole process is not going to be effective unless a majority of Canadians supports the effort. Take the time during the negotiations to speak to Ontarians. Tell them what kind of Canada you want to see. Tell them how the changes being considered can help that to come about. You will have to convince them that the methods are correct and the goal is worth supporting. If you fail to get the people on side, all you will have done is write an irrelevant document.

However, in the end, if the approach and values of your constituents cannot be reconciled with the demands facing you, then I urge you to oppose a strategy of appeasement just to see a deal made. The label "Canada" could have been put on any geographical area. You will be serving no one well if you allow the principles that define Canadians to be lost.

Mr Ferguson: One very short question: Is this the view of the southwestern region of the Liberal Party or is this your personal view?

Mr Kellam: This is a summary of a series of policy meetings that have been held throughout the southwest region and private meetings I have held with numerous riding presidents in the region.

Mr Ferguson: So it is—thank you. You have to be clear here.

The Chair: We have still a number of people who wish to speak. Given the hour, what I would like to suggest to the committee is that we go to about 10:15, which probably means two more speakers, and then conclude at that point, recognizing that there will still be a number of people who will not get reached. I think that that is probably the reasonable time to extend to in terms of what we can reasonably do. So just to continue in the same way that I have to date, if that is acceptable to the committee, I will call John Sparks.

JOHN SPARKS

Mr Sparks: I thank you for this opportunity. I go to university at McGill in Montreal and I live in Thunder Bay. I grew up in England for 10 years and I find Canada a wonderful place to live, the best place to live. My headmaster in England told my parents that I would probably be destined for unemployment, but I have come to Canada and I am going to university and I am doing fairly well.

My main point is that we as Canadians have never had a covenantal platform which has brought us together in an act of union right from the beginning. Basic unanimity about constitutional considerations that yields a high level of consensus and shared community of understanding must lie beneath the sometimes bitter contestation that goes on in election campaigns. It is this consensus, this recognition of our national purpose that all Canadians must share. We must pursue it, for surely a covenantal pact

will live much longer than past compromises and weak agreements.

There was a spirit of Confederation shared by many Fathers of Confederation. It assumed a commitment to eliminate cultural conflict through the acceptance and the permanence of the French fact. This commitment was evident in the Manitoba Act of 1870, but English Canada's unforgiving attitudes towards French language and religious education have emphasized our lack of fundamental agreement on principles and values of Canadian nationhood.

Some of you will be familiar with regulation 17 in 1912, enacted by the Ontario government, making French education in Ontario illegal. These acts marked the beginning of a different covenant which has developed, and it finds a lot of strength today in its disunity. It is a compact of provinces and it has left us weak and fractured into regions and communities that share little in common.

There was an alternative covenant from the post-Confederation era. It was an alliance of peoples with two working languages and equal rights throughout the entire country. I think if we are to live together as Canadians, this is our only true hope for unifying ethnic tensions. A language for understanding one another is a precondition for a language of covenant, and ultimately for common political nationality.

Our province has been the lynchpin, the golden link in Confederation. We have benefited the most from this agreement. Now it is our time to give the most.

The Ontario government should require that all provincial services be given in either of Canada's two official languages. This legislation is both fitting for Ontario's sizeable francophone community of more than half a million people and the recognition that Quebecers have a right to grow in the rest of Canada. Quebecers need to be encouraged. This will not come here unless they can be provided with services to enable them to live as normal people. Encouragement is essential.

We have played a role in creating Fortress Quebec. By restricting the role of French outside of Quebec, French Canadians have had no choice but to fall back on one homeland where they know their protection and security is guaranteed. By giving French Canadians a future in Ontario, we in turn strip away Quebec's power to be the exclusive voice of French Canadians, their language and their culture. It is only then when we can develop a covenant of mutual understanding. Until that is done, constitutional negotiations will be futile.

2210

Public opinion in Quebec has been fed dishonest generalizations and vivid imagery through the media and politicians in Quebec. The Brockville incident, Sault Ste Marie's resolution, Canada's supposed rejection of the Meech Lake accord are all good examples. It is no wonder that sovereignty in Quebec is so high in the polls. It is these polls that have created the Allaire report. Quebecers are not indifferent. They have been told that they are disliked, and now they are packing their bags. By declaring French as an official language, you will give French Canadians a feeling that they are respected in the rest of Canada. What is the point of having a country where you cannot

speak your own language outside of your provincial boundaries? It does not make much sense.

Actually I would like to remind you of that in reference to the referendum that Bourassa has proposed in 1992. By offering bilingualism you have a chance to affect public opinion in Quebec. As elected politicians you will be highly sensitive to the repercussions of such a move. But ironically, Quebec separatists intelligently want a unilingual Canada. Bilingualism strengthens national vision; it bridges communication gaps. Canada can only survive if it provides linguistic equality for all citizens, including French Canadians, who must feel they can live anywhere in Canada, not just in Quebec.

My second proposal urges Ontario to vigorously resist further demands for decentralization of the Canadian state. Scholars already agree that Canada is about as decentralized as you can get. Quebec's new demands will render the federal government useless as an expression of the Canadian people. A final step towards independence for Quebecers will merely be a formality. Look at us now: We are 11 governments pursuing visions instead of one; 200 cabinet ministers building empires instead of 25 and so on.

Executive federalism has placed enormous power and essential provincial jurisdictions in the hands of one leader and his inner circle. Rigid party discipline creates absolute power packages for parties in four-year terms. Federal disallowance power and the role of the Lieutenant Governor are now nonfunctional. Canada resembles England at the time of King John, 10 private fiefdoms in which the provincial boundary is the most significant basis of political allegiance.

The Chair: Mr Sparks, perhaps you would sum up.

Mr Sparks: By establishing a covenant we bring people together; we ensure mutual understanding. There is no time now, but it is more critical to do this. I hope you will be sensitive to the special situation that we are in right now, and being a resident of Quebec, it is a highly precarious position because they are ready, they feel disliked and they are ready to go.

MARK BREMNER

The Chair: I call last Mark Bremner.

Mr Bremner: Members of this committee, I would like to talk to you about employment equity.

I graduated from university and got my BSc. If we look at two candidates for a job who have the same qualifications, and look at the one person who after six months will get a promotion and then the deaf candidate stays for three years with no promotion, we still have the same educational levels but we are not given those promotions. People who go into work in financial institutions like a bank may not have qualifications but after a few years of experience become supervisors. But we do not have those opportunities. So there needs to be more employment equity.

There are other opportunities within a bank to allow deaf people to function. We do not necessarily have to deal on a daily basis with consumers. There are other jobs that we can do. We can go for example to a Visa centre, the bank centre, we can go into the credit department, we can go into the cheque centre. There are other opportunities for

deaf people other than having to talk to customers or to be on the phone.

We have many other people, for example, East Indian or French or native people, who come in and who have been hired before me, but they have not received the same promotions, have not received equal promotion as well. They have been ignored. That is all I would like to say.

The Chair: I think with that we conclude our stop here in the Kitchener-Waterloo area. Before I conclude, would like to give an opportunity to the local members.

Mr Ferguson: I would just like to extend my sincere thanks to the number of individuals from Kitchener-Waterloo and the surrounding area who took time to come out this evening. I think it has just been an excellent turnout evident by the overflow crowd that we had to put in the other room. I am hearing that this is the greatest number of people who have attended the committee hearings to date.

I think we heard a wide divergence of opinions from one side of the spectrum to the other. I think that is healthy and I think that is what the committee needs to hear. So just want to extend my sincere thanks to all those individuals who took time out of their busy lives to come out this evening, and also to the committee members as well. I sat with the committee all day today and I recognize it gets very tiring after the 45th or 50th presentation. I want to thank you for making this one of the stops on the tour.

Mrs Witmer: I would like to echo some of the comments that Mr Ferguson has made. I certainly appreciate that this Kitchener stop was added at the last minute. I do regret that not all those who wanted to speak have had the opportunity to do so. I hope that if you do have something that you would like to share you will put your opinion on paper and send it to Mr Silipo. I know he would appreciate receiving that information.

I think the presentations have been excellent. I think there has been a good cross-representation of our community. However, I do regret that there are some voices we have not heard from. We did not hear from all that many students this evening and I do find that regrettable. We did not hear from the labour community and from the business community. Certainly there were not many minority groups here this evening, and I do regret that those people were not able to participate.

I am pleased with what I did hear. I think overall people were saying we need to keep Canada together and certainly that there is an important role that the province of Ontario can play. I am certainly prepared to work with the government in making sure that Canada remains united.

The Chair: Thank you. I just would like to say that we do appreciate the comments that we have heard from the many people who did speak to us today. We heard from 24 individuals or organizations this evening and many others, of course, throughout the day and throughout the time so far.

We will continue our hearings tomorrow in Brantford and Hamilton. I invite any of you here who are interested in following our proceedings that you can continue to do so over the parliamentary channel. With that, again I thank you and good night.

The committee adjourned at 2220.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 20 February 1991

London Intercommunity Health Centre	C-557
Bob Wood	C-559
Hillary Edward	C-561
Cross Cultural Learner Centre	C-562
Susan Smith	C-565
Errol Mendes	C-566
London Cultural Interpretation Service	C-569
Todd Buttenham	C-571
Andreas Papadopoulos	C-573
Connor McDonough	C-575
Laurent Proulx	C-577
Dianne Haskett	C-579
Joanne Goure	C-581
N'Amerind Friendship Centre	C-581
Janet Collins	C-583
Afternoon sitting	C-586
John Russell	C-586
Harry Rudolfs	C-588
London Native Rights Support Group	C-589
Pauline Faubert-McCabe	C-592
University of Western Ontario Society of Graduate Students	C-594
Femmes du Sud de l'Ontario, section du comité de Middlesex et London	C-595
Darlene Cliche-Parker	C-596
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario	C-598
London and District Labour Council	C-599
Dennis Hudecki	C-601
Evening sitting	C-603
Social Planning Council of Kitchener-Waterloo	C-603
Conseil scolaire des écoles séparées de Wellington	C-604
Alvin Smith	C-605
Mark Whaley	C-606
Terrance Steven Carter	C-607
Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens	C-608
Fred Hutter	C-609
Robert London	C-610
Martha Willis	C-611
Shawn Hamill	C-611
Gisèle Latour	C-612
Paul Latour	C-613
William Giverin	C-614
Annabel Cathrall	C-614
Paul Johnson	C-615
Rodney Pinkney	C-616
Claude Charpentier	C-616
Ernie Anderson	C-617
Iunius Lockhart	C-618
Joanne Cripps	C-618
University of Waterloo Federation of Students	C-619
South Western Region Liberal Party of Canada (Ontario)	C-621
John Sparks	C-623
Mark Bremner	C-624
Adjournment	C-624

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)

Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

Arnott, Ted (Wellington PC) for Mr Harnick

Cunningham, Dianne E. (London North PC) for Mr Eves

Ferguson, Will (Kitchener NDP) for Mr F. Wilson

MacKinnon, Ellen (Lambton NDP) for Ms Harrington

Witmer, Elizabeth (Waterloo North PC) for Mr Eves

Also taking part: Sutherland, Kimble (Oxford NDP)

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis

Staff:

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Murray, Paul, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



C-15 1991

C-15 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 35th Parliament

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Thursday 21 February 1991

**Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation**

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 35^e législature

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Le jeudi 21 février 1991

**Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération**

**Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**

**Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel**

**Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron**



**Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron**

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Thursday 21 February 1991

The committee met at 1014 at the Woodland Cultural Centre, Brantford.

The Chair: Good morning. My name is Tony Silipo. I am in the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. I want to welcome on behalf of the committee the people here with us this morning, "here" being the Woodland Cultural Centre in Brantford. We are happy to be in Brantford this morning as part of the series of hearings we have been holding across the province on Ontario in Confederation, trying to get the views of people from across the province on the future of the country and the future of our province within that country.

We have a number of speakers to hear from this morning. In addition to the printed list, we have a number of other people who have indicated an interest in speaking to us. In the usual fashion we have adopted as we go along, we are going to ask people to try to keep their comments to within 10 minutes if they are speaking as individuals and within 20 minutes if they are speaking for organizations or groups; that will allow us time to fit in as many of the speakers as we possibly can.

I am going to introduce the members of the committee, but before I do I want to turn to Reg Henry, who is one of the native elders. Of course, the centre is a cultural centre of the Six Nations; we are happy for that reason as well to be here. Reg Henry is going to say a few words by way of beginning.

Mr Henry: [Remarks in native language].

The Chair: Thank you very much.

This committee is, of course, an all-party committee made up of representatives from the three political parties which are represented at Queen's Park. I would like to introduce the members of the committee. From the NDP caucus, in addition to myself there is Gary Malkowski; Gilles Bisson, the Vice-Chair of the committee, will be joining us shortly; Marilyn Churley; Brad Ward joins us this morning, who is also the local member; and Ellen MacKinnon. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Oer, Yvonne O'Neill, Steven Offer; from the Conservative caucus, Ted Arnott.

Mr B. Ward: Mr Chair, before we start proceedings, on behalf of the people of Brantford and the surrounding area I would like to welcome the committee to our fine community. We are very thankful that you allowed the people of Brantford and the surrounding area to express their opinions on Ontario's role in the future of Canada, very thankful that you selected Brantford as one of the any stops in your busy schedule.

The Chair: I would also like to ask Joanna Bedard from the Woodland Cultural Centre to say a few words to us.

Ms Bedard: I would like to say good morning to everybody and advise them that the centre is located on the

territory of the Six Nations of the Grand. I would like you to feel very welcome here on Iroquoian first nations territory. We hope your meetings will be successful.

Mr Henry in his address offered thanksgiving for all the beautiful things the Creator has provided to our country and has asked the blessing of the Creator on our proceedings and that we will become of one mind and be able to speak in unity. On behalf of all of the nations that support this centre—there are six of them—I would like to bid you welcome. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

JOHN JOHNSON

The Chair: We will proceed now with our first speaker. I call John Johnson to come forward.

Mr Johnson: Mr Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate greatly the opportunity of appearing before you. I realize that as an individual the time I have is very limited. I do have a script. It takes me 10 minutes.

This select committee is performing an invaluable service by enabling Canadians to take their first steps along the road to defining their own destiny.

My remarks and suggestions are divided into three general areas: the new Canadian Constitution, our political processes and the financing of government operations. At the outset, I must point out that I am a layman with no particular expertise in any of these areas. However, I have certain feelings and beliefs that come from a lifetime here in Ontario.

First, the new Canadian Constitution: In 1980-81, when the Constitution of Canada was repatriated and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms added, political and bureaucratic élites made the critical tradeoffs and decisions. The people of Canada were excluded from the process. Throughout the Meech Lake accord fiasco of 1990, citizens were kept even more in the dark while a dozen or so men met in secret to roll the dice on Canada's future.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines "constitution" as "a body of fundamental principles according to which a nation is constituted and governed." One advantage of the very public failure of the Meech Lake accord is that Canadians are now determined not to be excluded from the development of, and the opportunity to give final ratification to, the principles which govern and constitute this nation.

1020

I have some suggestions:

1. That a national constitutional convention be convened for the sole purpose of drafting a new Canadian Constitution. The convention would consider the report of this select committee and the reports and briefs of other committees and commissions presently meeting across Canada. It would also study other materials it considers relevant to prepare a new Canadian Constitution.

This new Canadian Constitution would be made official by a direct referendum. A double simple majority would ensure that the needs and wishes of Canadians in all regions of the country had been addressed, that is, a simple majority vote of the electorate of Canada including approval by a simple majority vote of the electorate in at least two thirds of the provinces and territories.

Should the new Constitution not pass this test, it would be sent back to the national constitutional convention for revision. The people must always have the right and the power to say: "It's not good enough yet. Redraft it and resubmit it to us for our consideration."

2. That future amendments to the Constitution will not become law unless and until they have been approved by direct referendum with the double simple majority provision outlined before.

3. That a provision be enshrined in the Constitution whereby the people have the right to initiate amendments to their Constitution by referendum. This would protect Canadians from unwise decisions by judges and ensure that the will of the people is sovereign.

4. That if the Charter of Rights is maintained, the "notwithstanding" clause be deleted. This would prevent governments from skirting constitutional provisions protecting the rights of people.

5. That there be provisions in the Constitution which will ensure that all governments and all government agencies are subject to the rule of law, as are its citizens, and are not above it.

6. That the principles of a free and democratic society and the unrestricted freedom of Canadians to move, live and work anywhere in Canada are included in the Constitution.

7. That provisions be enshrined whereby there will be an elected Senate with equal representation from each of the provinces and territories and that its effectiveness will be ensured by a clear delineation of its powers and duties vis-à-vis the House of Commons.

8. That in the division of powers between the federal government and the provinces the federal government will exercise strong leadership in those areas that are truly national in scope—such as defence, coast guard, external affairs, criminal justice, finance, environment, immigration, international trade and commerce, customs, transcontinental communications and energy—and that the federal government will abandon its right to interfere in areas of provincial jurisdiction through the use of borrowing and spending powers.

9. That the provinces are responsible for everything for their residents except for the federal functions outlined above. Each province will have its own Constitution, Parliament, courts, medical systems, schools, welfare and other services, distinctiveness, culture and language or languages.

10. Ensure that each province is naturally distinct and allowed to develop in its own way with complete freedom of movement, languages and culture between provinces.

11. That there is enshrined the right and the process for the peoples of the Yukon and Northwest Territories to join the other provinces with full provincial powers when the people of each of those territories, individually, deem they are ready to do so and wish to do so.

12. That the rights and privileges of native peoples self-government with powers and duties similar to those of the provinces if the native peoples so desire be enshrined.

The political process: Recent events at the federal level—Meech Lake, Oka, the Senate "caper," and the raising of the goods and services tax—have brought to actions of politicians, political parties and the political process into disrepute.

The democratic ideal of government of the people, by the people and for the people has been torn from our grasp. We have become a part-time democracy. Although elections are permitted to cast their ballots, the resulting governments, sometimes formed with less than half of the popular vote, ride roughshod over the wishes of the electorate for the next four or five years. This arrogance stems from the lack of checks and balances in our system. The party leaders and the party whip ensure blind subservience by the members of their caucus to the party line.

Here are some suggestions:

1. Ensure that all new major legislative initiatives at both the provincial and federal levels are submitted to the appropriate peoples for referendum. Such matters as free trade, abortion, capital punishment, budgets, the GST and no-fault insurance would require a referendum. Failure to pass would mean the proposed legislation could not be enacted. It would not mean the defeat of the government.

2. Ensure that all votes in the Senate, the House of Commons and the provincial legislatures are free votes. In each case, the elected representative would vote in accordance with the wishes of his or her constituents.

Here I have a couple of notes:

1. The duty of the elected members to those who elect them supersedes their obligations to their political parties.

2. The defeat of a government measure does not automatically mean the defeat of the government. The defeat of a government motion would be followed by a motion of non-confidence, the passage of which would require either the resignation of the government or dissolution for a new election.

3. Amend the oath of office sworn by members of Parliament such that they swear or affirm allegiance to their constituents as well as to the Queen.

4. Ensure there is provision for the recall of any representative who grossly neglects the directions of her or his constituents.

Finally, the financing of government operations: Premier Bob Rae, in his open letter at the beginning of the public discussion paper Changing for the Better, requested that each of us ask ourselves: What do we share as Ontarians and Canadians?

It is my opinion that one thing we share as Ontarians and Canadians is an unconscionable tax burden placed on us by all three levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal. Government spending in Canada at all three levels rose from \$3 billion in 1947 to about \$30 billion in 1990, a 100-fold increase. During the same period of time, the average industrial aggregate wage rose from about \$3,000 to \$22,000, a seven and a half-fold increase.

In 1947 tax freedom day was 31 March. In 1990 it was July. With the imposition of the GST it is now closer to the middle of July.

The result of this orgy of government spending has not just been a calamitous decrease in Canadians' discretionary income; it has resulted in a huge, permanent and extremely costly government workforce.

In Switzerland, there are 50 citizens for each public servant. In Canada, there are just 10. The situation is even more alarming than these figures indicate. In Canada, for each government employee there are just four persons employed in the private sector.

United States Senator William Borah is reputed to have said, "The marvel of all history is the patience with which men and women submit to burdens unnecessarily laid upon them by their governments."

The unnecessary burden laid upon Canadian taxpayers by the federal government stems—

The Chair: Mr Johnson, if you would sum up, please. I am sorry. I did not want to cut you off in the middle of your sentence, but if you would just sum up at the end, that would be fine.

030

Mr Johnson: Sorry to overrun my time: just an indication—I think you could see I was heading towards it—that we are, in my opinion, very much overtaxed by all three levels of government, all three often working individually, seemingly without knowledge of what is happening at other levels.

I think that would be it. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Interjection: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: could I suggest that we not smoke in this auditorium during the hearings this morning?

The Chair: We will obviously respect the fact that we are not in our own building. If people could take what has been suggested as a request and perhaps try to accommodate it as best we can, I think it would be helpful for all of us.

CONSEIL DES ÉCOLES SÉPARÉES CATHOLIQUES ROMAINES DU DISTRICT DE HALDIMAND-NORFOLK

The Chair: Tom Klicek from the Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques romaines du district de Haldimand-Norfolk.

M. Klicek : Nous désirons vous remercier d'être venus à Brantford afin de nous rencontrer et de nous entendre avec nous. Des mercis vont également à tous ceux qui nous ont communiqué l'existence de ce comité et qui ont facilité notre participation à cette audience publique. Enfin, veuillez transmettre à notre honorable premier ministre, le honnorable Bob Rae, ainsi qu'à tous les députés ontariens des remerciements très sincères pour avoir mis sur pied ce comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

En ce moment, je représente la section de langue française du Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques romaines de Haldimand-Norfolk. À sa réunion du 11 février 1991, il a été proposé par moi-même, appuyé de Paul Serruys, que M^{me} Loison vienne vous présenter ce modeste mémoire

au nom de notre section de langue française. M^{me} Loison a mal à la gorge maintenant et elle m'a demandé de vous présenter ce mémoire à sa place. Je suis très honoré de pouvoir faire ça.

La communauté francophone de notre région est peu nombreuse, mais elle est dynamique et vibrante. Nous sommes fiers de nos succès et nous avons à cœur d'offrir à nos jeunes catholiques franco-ontariens la meilleure éducation possible en langue française d'abord, puis la maîtrise de l'anglais, afin d'en faire des citoyens dignes de notre province et de notre pays bilingue. Nous aimerions vous entretenir longuement des efforts concertés de nos ancêtres afin d'obtenir les établissements scolaires et la gestion de ces mêmes établissements pour le plus grand bien de nos élèves catholiques de langue française. Nous aimerions aussi souligner l'apport non seulement de tous les Ontariens, mais aussi de tous les Canadiens qui nous respectent et qui nous assurent leur collaboration dans la poursuite de nos droits.

Malheureusement, nous ne sommes pas ici dans ce but aujourd'hui. Tout de même, si nous sommes ici aujourd'hui, si nous pouvons communiquer en français, c'est grâce au labeur acharné de nos ardents devanciers dont nous sommes, et nous le répétons, très fiers.

Le Canada est à une étape difficile mais déterminante face à son avenir. L'échec du Lac Meech, les disparités régionales et sociales, la crise d'Oka, le traitement réservé aux premières nations, l'aliénation de l'Ouest et le mouvement souverainiste au Québec remettent en question l'existence même de notre pays, le Canada.

Nous croyons que l'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle prépondérant, d'abord, dans le rapprochement des différentes régions du pays. En effet, basée sur sa puissance économique et sa force d'attraction industrielle, la province a moins de demandes fondamentales, de changements à formuler et peut ainsi jouer un rôle de médiateur dans le rapprochement des différentes communautés.

À cause de la présence du demi-million de francophones, de nombreux groupes multiculturels et d'une présence importante des premières nations, l'Ontario est donc bien placé pour signaler l'importance de maintenir des liens étroits et fructueux entre les différents éléments de sa communauté.

Quant à nous, nous reconnaissons les efforts que le gouvernement de l'Ontario et notre communauté ont investis pour que les francophones d'ici se sentent partie prenante et participante au dynamisme de notre province.

Nous demandons que ces efforts soient poursuivis et intensifiés en favorisant l'établissement de conseils scolaires catholiques de langue française; en répondant dans les plus brefs délais aux demandes des collectifs du Nord et du Sud afin d'assurer la mise sur pied de collèges de langue française qui répondront aux besoins des diverses communautés francophones du Nord et du Sud; en s'assurant que les étudiants de langue française pourront poursuivre leurs études universitaires dans les cours de leur choix en français tant en Ontario qu'ailleurs au pays, tel qu'il se produit présentement grâce aux ententes conclues avec le Québec en pharmacie et en art dentaire etc. Il faut

prévoir le nombre de places requises par les besoins de notre population de langue française.

Il faudra prévoir un réseau universitaire de langue française géré par les Franco-Ontariens ; en déclarant que les communautés francophones, anglophones et autochtones ont égalité et statut en Ontario ; en déclarant l'Ontario bilingue — il faudra prévoir le niveau de bilinguisme des candidats qui occuperont les postes déclarés bilingues. Toute commission qui s'intéresse à la population en général doit être représentative de la population franco-ontarienne et comprendre 5% de Franco-Ontariens. Il faut éviter de passer son temps à étudier la population franco-ontarienne, qui est surétudiée, et passer à l'action afin d'éviter que les francophones ontariens soient obligés de faire appel à la justice pour revendiquer leurs droits : en faisant la promotion de la dualité linguistique de la province ; en préconisant l'utilisation des manuels d'histoire du Canada qui présentent toute la réalité — pas seulement ce qui l'affaire d'une communauté linguistique — afin de renseigner objectivement notre jeunesse qui pourra ensuite porter un jugement réaliste sur les faits présentés. Il faudrait subventionner la rédaction de tels manuels adaptés aux divers niveaux de tous les cycles.

En réponse au document de consultation, Changement et renouveau, nous ajoutons les commentaires suivants.

Vis-à-vis du Canada ; tout amendement à la Loi constitutionnelle de 1982 doit enchâsser les principes suivants : droits religieux acquis, article 93(1) de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867 ; articles 29 et 15 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés de 1982 ; par la suite des droits provinciaux qui nous ont été accordés après la lutte acharnée — Loi 30, etc ; droits linguistiques — maintien du bilinguisme institutionnel, article 23 de la Charte ; droits sociaux — Loi de 1986 sur les services en français ; droits économiques — financement équitable pour répondre à ces droits.

L'unité du pays ne doit pas devenir un ballon politique dont les divers partis se servent pour faire avancer leur ambition partisane.

1040

Avant de rejeter d'emblée toutes les revendications du Québec, il faut les étudier à fond afin d'en découvrir les avantages et les inconvénients non seulement pour le Québec, mais pour chacune des autres provinces et pour l'ensemble du pays. Il y a sûrement des avantages d'assurer plus d'autonomie aux provinces dans certains domaines et en libérer le fédéral. Nous considérons que la récente décision au sujet d'émigration est un geste positif à l'égard du Québec qui n'enlève rien au reste du Canada mais qui aide réellement le Québec.

Si nous permettons que le Québec se sépare du Canada, qu'arrivera-t-il au reste du Canada ? Les Maritimes voudront-elles leur indépendance ? L'Ouest ? Et nous en Ontario, verrons-nous une division entre le Nord et le Sud ? Le Nord, trouvera-t-il avantageux de se joindre au Québec ? Jusqu'où ira l'effritement ? Quelle sera l'influence de cet effritement sur l'économie canadienne ? Pensons sérieusement aux avantages que les pays d'Europe recherchent en se regroupant sur le plan économique avant de nous lancer dans ce mouvement d'indépendance.

Vis-à-vis du Québec : pour bien comprendre la position indépendantiste du Québec, il faut se poser la bonne question et la voici : pourquoi les Québécois veulent-ils se séparer du reste de notre beau pays ?

Tentons d'y voir clair. Tout comme certains Québécois ne connaissent pas l'Ontario, y compris sa population francophone, plusieurs Ontariens de langue anglaise connaissent très mal le Québec. Leur est donc très difficile même impossible de s'apprécier mutuellement. Cette ignorance les empêche de connaître les services offerts aux deux minorités. Il y aurait avantage à ce que l'Ontario établisse un programme pour améliorer les relations Ontario-Québec, par exemple, pour que les Anglo-Québécois rencontrent les Anglo-Ontariens et que les Franco-Ontariens rencontrent les Québécois de la langue française. Ce geste pourrait être répété à l'échelle du pays.

Les médias peuvent jouer un grand rôle dans l'éducation populaire. Au lieu de monter en épingle les nombreux conflits, ils devraient être encouragés à bien renseigner les gens sur tout ce qui se fait et ce qui existe afin de rendre justice aux trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit les communautés autochtones, francophone anglophone.

Les groupes qui ont le souci de promouvoir la discordance entre ces communautés ne devraient pas recevoir de subventions gouvernementales. Tenant compte de sa situation minoritaire, le Québec se sent menacé linguistiquement, culturellement et économiquement à l'intérieur du Canada et surtout au sein de l'Amérique, et avec raison. Dans une démocratie, on est souvent porté à croire que tout doit être décidé par la majorité en fonction de la majorité. Toutefois, il ne faut pas oublier qu'une démocratie qui se respecte doit traiter équitablement ses minorités. En traitant équitablement ses minorités et en encourageant les autres provinces à faire de même, l'Ontario créera un climat de confiance chez tous ceux qui font partie des minorités comprises les Québécois.

Le Québec est reconnu comme étant dans les faits une société distincte. Cela n'enlève rien à l'Ontario que ce fait soit reconnu et que certains pouvoirs distincts soient rattachés au Québec.

Vis-à-vis des premières nations : les premières nations constituant des sociétés distinctes et devraient jouir d'un degré d'autonomie leur permettant de gérer leur présent et déterminer leur avenir.

Conclusion : à ce moment critique de l'histoire de notre pays, notre gouvernement ontarien doit assumer un rôle de leadership dans la définition de notre pays. Il se doit de connaître les aspirations des trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit les communautés autochtones, francophone et anglophone. Il doit valoriser l'apport des générations successives de néo-Canadiens au développement de l'une ou l'autre de ces trois communautés. Il doit reconnaître un statut égal à chacune des trois communautés nationales suite au rôle historique et honorable qu'a joué chacune à joué. Il doit se rappeler le rôle prépondérant de la communauté francophone dans la découverte et le développement de l'Ontario, rôle qui remonte à plus de trois siècles. En assurant une égalité de chance à ses propri-

communautés, l'Ontario pourra donner le ton ou l'exemple au sein de la Confédération.

PETER LEIBOVITCH

The Chair: Could I call next Peter Leibovitch.

Mr Leibovitch: First, I worked on this in the last 24 hours, including last night and this morning, and I have not had a chance to make copies. I could give copies to the committee within 48 hours. I will read from my brief and you can tell me when my time is up.

Brothers and sisters, I welcome this opportunity to share some thoughts with the select committee on Ontario Confederation. I believe the initiative represented by our tour of hearings around the province is one of the most important steps taken by Ontario's new government, and I commend you for the work you are undertaking.

I come before you wearing many hats. I am an industrial worker, president of an important local union with the United Steelworkers of America, president of the Simcoe District Labour Council, a political activist for as far back as I can remember, an English-speaking native of Quebec of European parentage, and a desperately concerned citizen of a country I love very much.

050

In recent months, I and thousands of other steelworkers went through a lengthy and exhausting strike with a major employer in a deeply troubled industry. Given the well-known difficulties in Canadian steelmaking and the looming disaster of a three-way free trade agreement embracing Mexico, union activists like myself have more than enough to keep us occupied on behalf of the members we are privileged to serve. But union activism in the final analysis is only a particularly intense form of citizenship. Our work for the wellbeing of those we represent in the workplace is never divorced from the larger community or from its troubles, and that is why I am here before you.

In many ways the union I belong to, the steelworkers, of which I am a proud member, is a microcosm of Canada, and participation in both the bargaining and policy development of my union has been an education about Canada. Like Canada, my union as an international union is bonded closely to its American section; like Canada, the internal administration of the steelworkers in Canada is very decentralized. Its day-to-day affairs are administered primarily through three regionally based districts, each headed by elected directors. The national director co-ordinates the union's technical services across all the districts, in a fashion analogous to federal equalization payments for the maintenance of standardized services. Like Canada, in other words, administrative authority is spread among different people at different levels; like Canada, this structure has allowed local and regional identities a great deal of scope.

Our Quebec membership, numbering currently over 10,000, or close to one third of our Canadian membership, has, not surprisingly, evolved a unique and feisty identity within the larger structure, and three of our four elected directors are francophone, no small tribute to the political strength of the French factor in the steelworkers union.

Let me make one last point about our union structure, this time an economic point. In spite of our name, only a

minority of our total membership is employed in basic steelmaking. We have tens of thousands of miners, all sorts of workers in small manufacturing and an increasingly large portion of our membership in services, including over 12,000 security guards and workers in nursing homes, restaurants and hotels. The point I am highlighting is that our union, unlike any other in Canada, is deeply interconnected with all three economic sectors: primary resources, secondary manufacturing and tertiary services. We are not only a structural echo of Canada's form; we are very much an image of its economic content as well.

I have drawn this picture to put my remarks in context. Does the close parallel of the life of my union with that of Canada grant us any special insight into the state of the nation? Not particularly, I suppose, but it certainly has meant that the virtues of tolerance, respect for pluralism, for the other person's language and background, have had to become part of the practical *modus operandi* of the union, rather than simply abstractions we trot out for special occasions. We still have a very long way to go. We know that. I am sure there is plenty of more or less submerged intolerance in our ranks, but many of us, particularly in the Stelco chain, have had the experience of working closely at the bargaining table and on picket lines with our Quebec brothers and sisters. Many of us have worked with Québécois workers on resolutions and policy committees. We have seen the particular space carved out within the steelworkers by our Quebec members as something very positive and enriching to the union's life as a whole; in turn, our Quebec section has to date shown little interest in separating out of the union as a whole.

For these reasons and others, many of the elected leaders of the steelworkers in English Canada, myself included, were very supportive of the Meech Lake accord. As you know, that support gradually became a minority position within the labour movement and within much of the progressive community, not to mention in much of English Canada at large, although frequently for less than savoury reasons.

I share some of the same concerns often expressed by others about the accord's ambivalent impact on or simple neglect of issues of importance to women and aboriginal groups, about the apparent impact on federal operating powers and the questionable devolution to the provinces of decisions on judicial appointments. But let me be frank. I also really felt that much of the anti-Meech hysteria was misplaced at best and malicious at worst. I subscribe to the view which was articulated well by then opposition leader Bob Rae and by Richard Allen, that the Meech agreement had to be understood in historical context, that the 1987 round of constitutional talks had to be Quebec's round after the debacle of 1980, and that the Trudeau government had badly bungled its response to the 1980 referendum and reparations were therefore urgent and that Meech itself could never be regarded as a closed case; by that I mean that its flaws were themselves guarantees that constitutional debate would continue on into the future and politicians would have to respond to the political mobilizations around its bad points and omissions.

My own view was that opportunities to repair the flaws in the Meech Lake accord were far more likely to come around again in the short term than were any opportunities to repair the damage done if Quebec were excluded once again. It was a matter of making hard choices and assessing risks. I do not deny the passions and arguments on all sides. My own humble view of these events of last spring and summer is simply that Canada made one big, tragic collective mistake.

But Canada remains one of the most important experiments in different groups living together over a vast geographical expanse that one can imagine. With our relatively small population, relatively high standard of living, relatively rich resource base—well, let's just say that if this country cannot work, prospects cannot be bright for anyone else.

But the Canadian federation of the 1990s and the 21st century is very hard to describe. Where we can go from here and what role Ontario can play in a new Canada are beyond my prescriptive powers. But it is important that we err on the side of generosity in dealing with Quebec, however appalled we might feel about the apparent extremism embodied in such things as the Allaire report or the more glassy-eyed expressions of insular nationalism. Generosity does not mean submission; it means active, intelligent engagement with the issues thrown up by Quebec's national aspirations. I believe Canadians were badly misled over the years by the Trudeau caricature of Quebec nationalism and its implications. It was always more complex and more subtle, even psychological, than was painted in the federalist-good-guys and nationalist-bad-guys picture of Trudeau.

Trudeau's particular vision of a federally integrated French Canada, underwritten by statutory bilingualism, was bound to make Quebec look ungrateful and insensitive once a different strain of nationalism gained ascendancy, a strain that looked more logically to Quebec's own physical space as its cultural ground than from sea to shining sea. By spending years arguing for and against Trudeau's particular vision, English Canada became ill equipped, and in some ways not even inclined, to engage intellectually and politically with the deeper reality emerging in Quebec, and we also simply lost a lot of valuable time.

But blaming Trudeau, while always fun and justified, is almost irrelevant if it were not for his occasional and unhelpful Nixon-like reappearances on the national stage. English Canada, like much of the western world and including the democratic labour movement, has long harboured a prudent and healthy scepticism of virulent forms of nationalism, a caution bred of bitter historical experiences. But too often even that cautious scepticism tends to paint all shades of nationalism with one colour, and that in turn can easily turn into the kind of anti-nationalism which shares the same traits of intolerance it claims to find in its opposite.

Let me put it differently. You cannot tell me that much of the anti-Quebec sentiment growing in English Canada has anything to do with holding principled, philosophical positions opposed to nationalism itself.

But when I turn my question back on myself, answer again seem elusive. Just how do we engage intelligently here in Ontario with the complexity and the momentum of Quebec's national drive without falling victim to caricatures, while at the same time maintaining our prudence while working the whole of Confederation together in some renovated form?

For ordinary Canadians like me, and perhaps especially for trade unionists, we can restart at the level of civil society. The phrase "civil society" has regained currency in the wake of the 1989 upheavals in eastern Europe. It refers to all those associations and activities of free individuals that exist autonomously, if not exactly independent of the state or other megastructures like multinational corporations. In our context, the term refers to labour unions, churches, volunteer organizations, political parties, single-issue movements and all manner of artistic and cultural activities.

1100

My sense is that linkage between English Canada and Quebec at the level of civil society has suffered grievously because of the constitutional crisis. All sorts of linkage exist formally or on paper, but the kind of volunteerist activism that civil society requires has been declining in Canada, not growing; and the constitutional crisis, as said, has worsened matters if only because of its sheer endless unpleasantness over what they interpret as Quebec's ingratitude for what Trudeau-style federalism attempted to accomplish. They find it difficult, almost impossible, to make the leap of empathy, that is, to try and view things from the Québécois side, from which the Trudeau vision always appeared as only one particular optic for French-Canadian aspirations, not as the very glue of an all-accommodating Confederation.

For many of us in the labour movement, the sovereignty of our Quebec unions' brothers and sisters was puzzling, to say the least. We proudly linked arms with them in many struggles against unfair employers or for expanded union rights and better working conditions, but these were expressions of collective struggle for collective rights we could identify with: the right to full employment, a safe workplace or an adequate social insurance regime, all of which speak to the material and economic wellbeing of workers—the very purpose of the labour movement, or so we assumed. It was always difficult, and still is, for English Canadian unionists to appreciate, let alone identify with the power which the collective right of language and culture holds for ordinary Quebec workers.

The history of industrial relations in Quebec is a true microcosm of the more general history of a conquered nation in subordination to another. The memory of English-speaking bosses over French-speaking workforces has bequeathed a special passion and prickly militancy to the activism of Quebec labour, qualities that have often been envied by us in English Canada even while we were perplexed about their meaning. The historical memory is also what fuels the commitment of both of Quebec's otherwise rival labour federations to play a front-line role in a new sovereign Quebec. But it seems to me that this is where English-Canadian workers can play a role, where a particular and very important part of civil society can foster

understanding and co-operation, and where a union like my own, implicated as it is in all sections of the economy, must try to find ways to build new alliances.

Let me back up. As I said earlier, Quebec nationalism is a complex phenomenon, not a simple one. For all the attention focused on language and culture, the nationalism pursued by the Quebec labour movement and by the progressive or social democratic wing of the Parti québécois is always coupled self-determination with the kinds of collective social rights and entitlements that are the *raison d'être* of labour everywhere. But throughout Canada, those rights and entitlements are under attack by the forces of corporate power, aided and abetted by a harrowing recession. What I am suggesting in one sense is very simple but not very simplistic. I am suggesting, at least as an example to other sectors in civil society, that the labour movement outside Quebec line up foursquare behind the progressive wing of Quebec nationalism. I do not mean playing a partisan role in accelerating a political division of Quebec from Canada; I mean redoubling our efforts to work together, to share information, to build working groups on everything from occupational health and safety to worker controlled investment funds; I mean making an extraordinary effort to focus on these policy areas around economic and material collective rights that contribute to humanizing our social life.

If we can somehow, by an act of will, stop fretting over what form Quebec sovereignty will take within an altered federation, if we can concentrate our energies instead on the content of our social life together, by aiding those who, whatever their views about the federal state, seek to build a regime of social justice in Quebec, we could be making the most important contribution of all. Ordinary citizens are unlikely to do any better than the legions of lawyers, constitutional experts, charismatic saviours and parochial provincial premiers have done so far in agreeing on the constitutional form Canada must take, but ordinary citizens cannot absent themselves from engaging in the struggle to fill out that form with a socially responsive content. That struggle will take different forms and address different priorities within the different sectors of civil society.

Labour naturally focuses on questions of workplace rights and economic wellbeing. Cultural groups, church organizations and all others will have to connect and re-connect in the areas of special concern, but I am convinced that this kind of reaching out by ordinary people through the vehicles of community volunteerism is profoundly necessary. Maybe, just possibly, we will help in small ways to forestall a traumatic rupture within our country. Maybe, just possibly, it will give the ordinary people of Quebec a new perspective on what might be possible with a renovated confederation. Maybe, just maybe, it will give some people some reason to buy back into the Canadian dream.

Lest I sound a bit too Utopian, let me end on a note of hard reality. The subpolitical links that I am suggesting as being vitally needed to restore co-operation within Confederation are dependent, of course, on a healthy civil society. But as I commented before, active volunteerism is not noticeably increasing in Canada, at least as far as I can see, and with labour, women's, cultural and other groups under

siege by hostile employers, drastic funding cutbacks, a debilitating free trade agreement and the darker pathologies of a more violent society, little energy is sometimes left to even consider the rededication I suggest is necessary.

The problem is that Canada itself, after years of economic subservience to American capital, culminating in the systematic dismantling of much that we might call national, from rail services to the CBC, after years of missed opportunities to build a high value added independent economy with real mechanisms for worker involvement and participation, after years of subservience to someone else's foreign policy, the problem is that Canada itself sometimes seems like it has nothing left to buy into.

Little wonder people frequently bemoan the lack of a vigorous pan-Canadian nationalism. Well, I, for one, refuse to despair. This presentation itself is a small measure of the hope I feel that we can still build in the northern half of this continent a society that is equitable, sustainable, generous, tolerant and just. We simply need the will to do it.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Leibovitch. We have a bit of time if there are questions.

Mr Bisson: You said something at the very beginning which, quite frankly, I had never even thought about. I too come out of the steelworker organization. You talked about the structure by which regionalism in a sense is recognized, through the autonomy of the locals and then on to the districts and on to the international. I guess I am saying—I am trying to find a way to say this—that what is happening is that a lot of people are fighting against regionalism in the country, yet my own experience as a trade unionist tells me it works. How can we encourage the labour movement to work within society in order to get people to understand that possibly there is something to this?

Mr Leibovitch: I think our experience in the union and also the reality of the country is that Canada is actually a community of communities. Strikingly enough, you go from Newfoundland to Vancouver and you find many different kinds of cultural, economic and national feelings that are unique to those areas. The thing that keeps Canada together is the tolerance we have: Instead of forcing everybody into one melting pot as they have done in the States, we have allowed the regions and we have encouraged the regions to develop their own identity. That is what our strength is.

This is where I think Trudeau has done the greatest disservice to the country, trying to force a strong, centralized vision of a country which, in order to exist, needs that freedom to develop its own regional identities. The irony of it is that if you do not allow that to occur, then you have the reverse form, which Mulroney is doing, that by not allowing a healthy development of regions and keeping east-west communications alive, you are then allowing us to be open to that magnetic pull to the south. All the areas start getting pulled to the south and become more and more oriented towards the American economy, American culture and American ideology, which I think is very dangerous.

The Chair: I want to thank you for bringing that point forward.

SIX NATIONS COUNCIL

The Chair: We will proceed next with John Peters from the Six Nations Council.

Mr Peters: Brothers and sisters, greetings. To all you Euro-Canadians, I say great welcome to our territory.

I am not going to spend any time on all this constant bickering between anglophone and saxophone, I mean francophone. On 2 and 3 February in this very room there was a large meeting; the title was Iroquois Nations. It is the second meeting of such. One took place between Christmas and New Year's Day down at Tyendinaga. It was certainly something new for us. It was a working relationship between the elected councils, the Indian Act councils, which I sat on, and the confederacy councils, the condoled chiefs and the true councils. Someone said that they were speaking of a marriage between the councils. I for one have no intention of getting in bed with anybody, but we must come forward with a working paper from the people.

1110

What happened last summer at Kanesatake and Kahnawake—I was supposed to be up in Ottawa today at 10:30 at the standing committee on a hearing. I was supposed to be a witness because I was in at Kanesatake, so I know what I am talking about, but I had some weekend guests and I asked them, "Why can't you speak for yourselves?"

On 11 July they appealed to us, not for men, not for guns, but for food; they had nothing to eat. I went down there armed with a legal document signed by Siddon, Bourassa and Ciaccia. It said, "Free access of food, clothing, medical supplies, Indian leaders, spiritual men." It took us 20 hours, 10 hours to get there and 10 hours to get in. The minute we went over the border into Quebec, they pulled us into a weigh station and impounded the trucks and the food. We took seven convoys down there. Each time we had one hell of a time to get in there, but each time we were successful.

The last time I went, they told me: "No one is going in. You cannot go in to Kanesatake unless you have a permanent address." Luckily I used to be a union leader, so I am used to getting slapped around. They had international observers from Europe and there was a tall, very nice-looking young blonde girl. I assumed she was from Sweden so I went and spoke to her. But she was from France. I asked her if she would interpret them for me. We went to the head man for the Quebec police and I told him, "I do not speak French," not fluently. I used to work for Montjoie, so I heard enough of it, but I told him: "In our language, this is what you say. [Remarks in native language] That is the right name for this place. Literally translated that means 'where the council fire burns at Grand River.' Loosely translated, it means 'headquarters.' This right here is the same as Ottawa for you boys."

All the Iroquois nations in North America, what we call Turtle Island, look not to myself, but to the condoled chiefs. I see a couple here today. This was headquarters, and I said: "Explain to this guy that this is our land and our people and I am going in. We are all going in." Much to my surprise, she explained it to him in French and he said,

"Entrez, s'il vous plaît." So in we went. But then I stayed in there. I am not going to tell anybody about all the atrocities that went on in there, but I will tell you one thing: It is a good thing they did not privilege me to a gun, because some of the things I saw in there, I would have shot the sucker dead on the site, right there.

I have seen a young lady, a mother, bring a young Mohawk baby in a little cart up to the perimeter to see his father, and one of those soldiers urinated on that baby. I have seen that. If I had had a gun, I would have shot the sucker right on the site, but luckily you could not get a him. I am not going to go into all the atrocities. I am telling you that I was there and you can ask anybody. I put my name down. I filed a formal complaint that went back to the courts in Europe and I have to appear over there as a witness. I was to appear at 10:30 this morning in Ottawa but this came at the same time, so Chief William went to Ottawa and I came here.

I will not dwell on that any longer on Kanesatake, but what is happening—we had a meeting last night at the gym and we had a couple of federal revenueurs there explaining the GST. They felt that they were treated very poorly and they were. So I attempted to explain to them "What you are doing in reality is you are coming here tonight saying: 'Here is how my great-grandfather ripped off your great-grandfather. I am going to rip you off in the same manner.' Do you agree?" What the Indian Act has done is disregarded totally all of our treaties, all of our privileges. We are the landlords here. We are not a visible minority. We are the landlords. This is our country which we agreed to share—not for someone to become our political masters or us to become second-rate citizens, but to share.

Some of the condoled chiefs, I will not speak on the two-row wampum; that is their field, but what it states is there should be two vessels. The large vessel would be your ship, the small vessel would be ours and they run parallel. We do not tell you how to govern your people, nor do you tell us ours, but you have had your big feet in our canoe for so long now that we are getting pretty tired of rowing it like it is.

I will probably be cut off like the first gentlemen; then other guys talk as long as they want. When you leave here today, look at this grand building next door. There is quite a bit of media coverage on residential schools lately. There is the grandmother of them all right there, the Mohawk institute, better known as a mushhole. My wife spent eight years in that place and some of the atrocities that went on in that place would make you cry, but it still stands. A lot of people who were raised in there would wish to burn it down. There have been attempts to burn it down before.

Now I sit on elect councils, but I believe in the old way. I was the first councillor to ever refuse to pledge allegiance to the Queen. They used to send a bureaucrat down from Indian Affairs to swear us in. I refused to pledge allegiance to the Queen because it said right on the top and it was quite a legal-looking document. It had big red seals on it and your name printed on it and you signed beside that. For two years, you would serve the Queen. It made it very clear that it was not out of disrespect. I have met the Queen. I have sat with the Queen. She is a very

arming lady. When she was here for the Mohawk chapel was one of the honour guard that night. She is a very nice dy and it was no disrespect meant.

I was told, "You cannot sit on council if you do not edge." I said, "I was elected by the people and I will rve the people and if the Queen comes and objects, then will leave, but I am not leaving for some Palooka like ou." Well, I am still there; he is gone now. I guess he fended his political master and he is gone.

What I want to say before we finish is what I touched 1, how the Indian Act had total disregard for our treaties, ir special privileges as the original people here, and now e GST has come along and they are saying to us, "Oh, e are going to give you a great break, all you"—they call ; "Indians." I am not from India. But they say, "We're ing to give you a great break and we are going to stay nsistent with the Indian Act and all purchases on re-rves shall be exempt." Big hairy deal. You cannot buy a tit, a tie, a car, a stove, a bicycle—a new one—but I think ey think we should go to the Salvation Army for our ardrobe. They are not going to deliver a jacket.

An old lady called me two weeks ago and almost made e cry. Her granddaughter got married in Hamilton. She ent to buy a dress. Very limited income. She had to pay ST. She asked them to deliver it. They would not. She ecame angry and left. Consequently she did not go to her wn granddaughter's wedding over the GST.

What I am saying is the Indian Act did the same thing us, to our great-grandfathers when they said, "All the oney you earn on reserve will be tax exempt." Big deal. ight now, for instance, 200 years later, we have 16,000 embers at Six Nations, and of that there are not 300 who ork on the reserve.

I have paid taxes all my life. I have paid in excess of 1,000 a week in tax. I am an iron worker. I have belonged the iron workers for 37 years. I used to be a union resentative, and that is the international union. We had rely on the United States. When I first started here, it as 60 cents an hour and if you could not cut it they would ll you: "There are guys waiting at the gate. You better get t. There are no coffee breaks around here."

What the GST has done now is said, "We will stay nsistent with the Indian Act and we will rip you off the me way we ripped you off 200 years ago." But the thing our great-grandfathers could not read or write English, o they had an excuse, but as representatives, what are we ing to use for an excuse?

All we are looking is a legitimate means that we are mpt from GST. We are not exempt. We have tax-free atus, not just on reserve. It says right in the thing, "sur-rndered lands." We never surrendered any of these lands. hey ripped Joseph Brant off for them. We have a research epartment, one of the best in the world. He signed 999-year ases to set up a perpetual income for the Six Nations and ey were all switched around as surrenders and then they assed the 1841 land agreement. I do not know who else as seen that, but what that says is any Indian lands in spute shall fall under 1841 and shall be considered ceded.

Bingo, all of our lands were gone, but what it does say "on reserve or surrendered lands." We never surrendered

them, but they are gone and that is why I refuse to pay GST, especially here in Brantford or anyplace within the Grand River. The Haldimand deed says six miles on either side of the Grand from the mouth to the source. So it is ludicrous to pay GST here in Brantford. It is. But I guess that is enough time on that.

All I would like to say is there are some very wise leaders about, and there are some very unwise leaders about. I was labelled last summer a militant. First, I was labeled an alarmist, then a militant, then a warmonger by taking food. When we got down there one time, all they had to eat were about three jars of spaghetti sauce. No spaghetti; just sauce. Little kids had nothing to eat. Old people with diabetes were going into God damn comas because they could not get medicine. Everything was closed. There was no gas, was no food. They shut the hydro off, they shut the water off, they would not allow propane in there.

But in the paper you would see and on the media at night at supertime you would see where large quantities of food went in from the Red Cross. You were allowed one handbag a person and they were allowing 10 persons. So that was 10 handbags for the whole of Kanesatake. But they did not tell that they had shut all the gas off and there was no way to cook it, such things as that.

1120

As I said, today I wanted to go to Ottawa and truly intended to go, but Phil Monture, our research director, one of our counsellors, they are up there now. It started at 10:30. They asked if I would come here. One lady was in the House of Commons in Ottawa and she said, "I never heard anyone speak like you," she said. "I used to admire the old, tall, silent chiefs. I used to admire them so," and she even went like this. I said: "My dear, they're still home. They're sending ignorant suckers like me forth now to deal with, and they're going to put it on the table like it is."

I was accused of shooting from the hip because I have no notes. I was taught that we speak from here, your heart, and if you forget to bring that with you, you are in bad shape. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Peters. I do not know if you would be willing to answer any questions if there are any.

Mr Peters: I would be only too happy.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much.

Mr Peters: I have sat with Steven in police negotiations.

Mr Offer: Yes, I know that.

The Chair: Oh, oh.

Mr Offer: There is no "oh, oh" about it. It was quite good actually, as a matter of fact.

Thank you for your presentation. Right now I guess there is a presentation going down in Ottawa and I guess you are well aware of some of the issues, of course, that they are going to be bringing forward.

There is something that has sort of been bothering me and I would like if you could give me your impression. Right now Quebec and the federal government are talking about a redistribution of powers. We do not know exactly

what they are talking about, but there is something going on. I have heard, I think in some media reports, that maybe native affairs is on the table, that maybe they are going to be talking about responsibilities which are currently federal being looked after provincially and vice-versa.

Is this a concern by yourselves? Is this going to be something which is going to be raised? Is there some obligation on the part of provinces and the federal government—I am putting aside self-government for a moment—to at the very least inform and invite first nations in the event that these types of matters are on the table? I am just wondering if this is something which is of some concern or being discussed?

Mr Peters: Certainly. Who should be answering this is one of the condoled chiefs, because what has to be understood and what has to be—and it has to be dealt with soon, because some of the leaders going around, because there is an election next July internationally for the position George Erasmus holds, are making some pretty heavy statements, protecting themselves by saying, "I shall not be held responsible for all the civil unrest and whatever," that undoubtedly will boil over again next summer, and I do not think it is going to be that late next summer.

If something is not done, and soon—when I was in Kanesatake Mulroney made a speech and he said: "Boys, if you Mohawks will peacefully lay down your arms, we've now acquired the disputed lands. Lay down your arms. We'll negotiate immediately. We'll sign the title over tomorrow." But now they are saying, "No, use and benefit held as fee simple." We are not accepting it under use and benefit held fee simple. It is our land and it is coming back.

The scary part is a lot of these guys who say or profess to be great national leaders are actually politicians like you guys. What they are doing is saying, I guess, whatever they think will glean the most votes in the upcoming election, making statements like, "I warned you four years ago that the young people aren't going to sit idly by." It is not just the young people. I have been fighting all my life and I am going to continue to fight until I am done, and if it is tomorrow, I will be done. But the thing is, when you say, "Is there a concern?" what the federal government is doing—I should not be saying this; it should be one of the condoled chiefs, but they negotiate nation to nation with the crown.

Thanks to the Sparrow case now they have reminded the federal government that you must honour the obligations of the crown. They put the club back in our hand. We do not have to grovel around on all fours any more. Legally we are back in a good bargaining position, but what must be understood, as the federal government keeps delegating everything to the provinces, we have no agreements, no treaties, anything with the provinces. So that is what causes all the trouble.

I read a thing in the back of Maclean's there, when I used to have time to read. It was under the cover and it said that Canada is inhabited by 20 million sheep and we do not even bleat. Any other country in the world would be in open revolt in the streets if things were going on that are going on here, but we do not even bleat. It is up to you

boys if you want to bleat or not, but we are going to bleat no two ways about it.

Hopefully there will be no need for any bloodshed or to become militant or, of all things, have to have AK-47s. Now we have to have antitank weapons. They announced right in the paper that the Quebec police were shopping for Leopard tanks and they were successful. They found them and they got them. That is in anticipation of running over us next spring or summer. So I guess they are already gearing up for next summer.

The things that are going on right today at Kahnawake it is not done. Joseph Montour was the chief of police down there—they call him the Peacekeeper—for the last 20 years. I know this man. There is not a more honest man in the world and he was forced to kneel on his knees, him and one of his officers, and the Sûreté handcuffed him, took him and charged him for carrying weapons off-reserve.

We had a big Jay's Treaty conference in Cornwall and they were there. They were the security and everyone of them had a weapon. No one objected. They have gone to court numerous times and no one ever objected. But now because the Sûreté is in there and the RCMP, they are now trying to put the Kahnawake police out of business. They are saying, "You cannot." They charged him with carrying a firearm. This is true dictatorship, like the first gentleman spoke of. When any government can dictate that you have to speak French, or you as a Frenchman have to speak English, where does it say anything about our language? At Kahnawake, Mohawk is the first language and English is the second language.

1130

I have fought long and hard—not just me, a lot of people, especially this place right here—to just get curriculum dollars, because our language is teetering on the brink of extinction. There is one of the true speakers right there who opened this meeting, Reg Henry. He was no spring chicken, I will tell you, when he went back to school because for him to teach or for us to access any money for curriculum books or whatever, he had to go to school to get a little certificate showing that he was fluent. Fluency to me and to us is this: not just teaching the language; you have to teach the language, the culture, the ceremonies, the tradition and, above all, have enough guts to teach it, because our teachers do not teach it. Right on our own reserve we have the most-populated. We have 56 of our own teachers. That is colonial teaching—they are all Indian teachers. Quite some ago there was a body of people. They did not lobby; they became somewhat—so apparent, I guess. It was changed that there shall be 20 minutes set aside twice a week for Indian language but it was never taught.

My grandmother spoke fluent Mohawk. She was 10 years old when she died and she was sitting there smoking a little clay pipe. She used to go every day and sit outside in the sun. It did not matter if it was the middle of January. She would go outside for 15 minutes, wrap up, 104 years old, and sit out in the sun and then come back in. I come from a large family and only one of my brothers can speak fluent Mohawk because he used to stay nights with his grandma. My mother told her mother, "Don't teach these

you Mohawk because you'll just get them in trouble." They used to whip you at school for speaking Mohawk. If you were speaking Mohawk in the play yard, when you came back in the teacher would say: "Come on up here, John. You've been talking Mohawk again, eh?" and get out the strap and let you have it in front of everybody. There is no book out now that says, "You took my talk." You should read that some time.

I could go on all day on all the atrocities that have happened, but the thing of it is—I said this at that meeting—in 1924 they imposed this elect council on the Six Nations, which I am part of. I am there for one reason, to represent the people—not all of the people, because a lot of our people are traditional. They are forbidden to vote. It is not their choice. It is the teaching that no way can they vote for Indian Act.

We have to start honouring one another, having some mutual respect, because next year—it says, "In 1492, Columbus sailed the ocean blue," so next year it will be 500 years, but beware. It makes reference to this, in our ancient teachings, of this time—well, I am not going to tell you what it says, but I will say beware.

We have to be started. You guys, Mulroney, Bourassa, all of them, have to realize that we are not going to dry up and blow away. The thing with the land claims is they dare not pay one land claim. I have spent a lot of time with Joe Saunders, the head lawyer for the Assembly of First Nations, and he said, "John, the United States or Canada do not have enough money to pay you guys the interest they owe you, let alone the claims." If they settle one, the door is open. Then what happens? We are foolishly into a war now, we are into a recession, so we are going to have to wait until things heal up, then you can deal with us.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Peters. Just for the information of the members and the public, we do have a number of speakers still to hear from, so we will try our best to work our way through the list.

PAULINE JOHNSON COLLEGIATE

The Chair: Could I invite next the group of students from Pauline Johnson Collegiate—James Thompson, Maurice Deblicek and Patrick Kelley. We need you to identify yourselves for the record, either as you speak or at the beginning, as you please.

Mr Thompson: My name is Jim Thompson. On behalf of the concerned youth of Ontario we would like to briefly address the matter of the future of Canada, for, as we are continually being reminded, we are the citizens of the future and as such we should take more part in the process of building our new country. It is for this reason that I feel honoured and privileged to partake in these crucial proceedings.

Mr Chairman, committee members and fellow citizens, we are here to discuss an extremely important issue, that of the future of my homeland, Canada. There is little time for political rhetoric or long speeches, so I will state my feelings frankly.

Canada as we now know it is falling apart. Without drastic changes, we as a country may find ourselves with no future to look forward to. My Canada's future is one of

progress and prosperity. It is a future filled with peace, harmony, a place where others may come and feel welcome, welcome to live as they want to live. But, and this is the foundation of my Canada's future, it is a nation whose citizens are willing to give up a small part of themselves to ensure that their country remains unified and strong, citizens who are dedicated to ensuring that the freedoms of everyone, everybody in Canada, are preserved, not only their own culture but everybody's. It is a future where we throw away our racism and petty differences and work towards a common goal.

Therefore, it is a population dedicated to preserving Canada. Here we are addressing the question of loyalty. I do not wish to draw comparisons to our southerly neighbours, but I would like to point out that we can learn from them. America does not have the problems which we find ourselves presently in. They know who they are, where they are going and, most important, who their allegiance is to. They are Americans and they are proud of it.

Canada is a mosaic of people whose cultures are unique, but they combine these unique heritages to form what we call Canada. This is a noble idea in theory, but in practice I believe we have tried to apply it too precisely and too extensively, for in promoting individuality we have begun to lose the sight of our combined image. We have become radically separate peoples living within a common border, with nothing to unite us. I do not promote the total destruction of our mosaic policy, for this is the one fact that makes Canada unique. However, what I do propose is a dampening of this individuality, as it is progressively destroying us.

I feel the solution to our problems most definitely entails a change in thinking of all Canadians, but perhaps it will also entail a change in the geographical makeup of what is today Canada. As everyone knows, Quebec is threatening to separate. Already it feels itself a separate identity, just a small step away from independence. They have realized, perhaps before the rest of us, that the present Canada is not working and they have taken steps to counter this. I personally feel they have gone about this in exactly the wrong way. They have retreated inwards, addressing themselves, not the whole of Canada. As we are seeing, this leads to a split.

A successful Canada is everybody pulling together in the same direction under a unified government. Quebec is demanding powers which will separate it from the rest of Canada, namely, control over the environment, language and education. This is above and beyond those powers which they have already achieved. Decentralized government is not progress; it is a step backwards. While Europe and other areas in the world are moving forward towards unification, Canada is stepping back 200 years.

In short, I feel that Quebec must be strongly and completely united with the rest of the provinces in the future or it must go its own way, and quickly, before it causes further damage to what we know as Canada. The separation must be complete, with no strings whatsoever attached, as sovereignty-association implies. If Quebec does not feel it can stand on its own two feet, then why, I ask, is it moving forward towards separation at all? In terms of Canada, it

must be all or nothing. We have no room in Canada for people who take the easy way out. We are a country defined by its dedication to working together, surpassing all obstacles. To accept separatists in even the most minor way, is to accept those who are destroying Canada and what it stands for.

1140

However, the day Quebec separates will be a tragic day for Canada and one which I hope never comes. Presently, my Canada encompasses over six million square kilometres and 25 million of the world's best citizens. It includes the Yukon, Northwest Territories, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island and all those provinces in between. Each is important and essential to Canada, but not one more so than the others.

I would like my children to grow up in a Canada which is strong. If that future excludes parts of what is today Canada, then that is the starkness of reality. It is a harsh attitude, I realize, but it is what is needed, because only through complete unity and the loyalty of its citizens can Canada be truly free and prosperous.

On a more personal note, my mother and her parents came originally from Holland. Many traditions which my family follow are those of the Netherlands. However, I am not Dutch. I am not even Dutch Canadian. I am Canadian. My loyalties are to Canada and to Canada alone. That is the future of my Canada.

The Chair: Are there additional comments?

Mr Deblieck: Yes. My name is Maurice Deblieck. Canada's future at this time is extremely uncertain. Canada is a relatively young country and it is time that we, as a sovereign nation, began to mature. In order for Canada to grow up, we must for once end the English-French controversy that threatens to pull us apart. I believe it is time for English Canadians and French Canadians to place their respective cultures in the background and unite together as Canadians.

If we want to stay together, we must agree on this issue: We are not French or English; we are Canadians. We must be under the jurisdiction of one federal government rather than two. The reason for the lack of patriotism in this country, especially among young people, is because we see that our government cannot even make up its mind on many issues. How can we be proud of a country that is not sure of how it stands on any particular issue? For example, with the abortion bill our country refused to even take a stand. How can we, as young people, be patriotic to such a country? Many of my friends would not care whether we remain a nation or if we join the US as a state. If Canada wishes to survive into the 21st century, we must become one country united under one flag, rather than a collage of different cultures and governments. Thank you.

Mr Kelley: There are more problems for Canada than just the Quebec problem. There is the deficit. The GST has been proposed to remedy this situation. Contrary to popular belief, the GST will not destroy our country. European countries prosper with similar taxes, but they prosper because they manage money earned from this well, something which the Mulroney government is infamous for

doing a very bad job of. Some of you may remember the excessive amount that was spent on counting the shrubs on Mr Mulroney's lawn. This is characteristic of the government.

Free trade also is the largest problem facing Canada. Canada is incapable of dealing with the economic juggernaut that is the Americans. Many businesses and industries in Canada have already begun to crumble under the weight. The path the government has put us on with free trade and the GST is going in the opposite direction of the one Canada should be headed in. With free trade we have effectively lowered our defences against the American Tariffs are the only good defence, but the debate against free trade is one I am sure you are all familiar with and of the provincial government is not going to be able to afford a great deal.

It is this hearing that I wish to salute, because you are here to hear Canadians, something which I am sure the federal government is not that much interested in. The provincial government, although not in control of trade, can have some effect on it and it is here that I beg you to do everything in your power to do the one thing that can save Canada, and that is to get rid of free trade and the Conservatives. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. We do have time for some questions, if there are any.

Mr Bisson: One of the things the country was based on is this whole question of the mosaic that you talk about. You alluded to the fact that what we need to do is come together as one people, that if we have a common identity somehow we will be able to solve some of our problems as a nation. I would like you to answer the question and maybe draw the parallel: that experiment has been tried in the United States yet they do not have the social fabric or programs we have here. I put to you the question: possibly what is making people afraid here in Canada that we are losing our national institutions: CBC, Via Rail, all of those other programs that are affecting us, and maybe that is a reaction to what is happening now. Do you think that is part of the problem?

Mr Thompson: I think it might be. The term used in the United States is a melting pot; you are American first. I am not sure if you direct your question towards me, but I am not looking for a complete melting pot in Canada. What I am looking for is more of a balance between the Canadians where such things as language and culture do not have quite the impact they do now, because now, with the differences between French and English, we are finding there is a split; we have no way of getting across that.

Mr Bisson: Can I rephrase?

The Chair: No.

Mr Bisson: Okay.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think you have some very good from-the-heart messages in there mixed very much with your head. I wonder if you could say a little bit about it. Have you travelled in Quebec? Do you communicate with students in Quebec? Have you brought that to your school student council? We have heard this across the province that we can begin these things in small ways. You, a

certainly your exposure today to the whole province, can be very great multipliers. Can you say a little about why you feel the way you do? Is it a personal experience or are they goals and ideals?

Mr Thompson: No, it is not a personal experience, and I have absolutely nothing against Quebec as a people. I have travelled through Quebec, I have several penpals, I have taken part in an exchange with Quebec, and the people of Quebec are no different from what we, the English part of Canada, are. What is different is that they feel their language and their culture must be addressed so specifically that they are losing the identity of Canada. They are not working towards being Canadian; they are working towards being French, and that is what I oppose. That is why I am saying that I will feel extremely sorry if we do lose Quebec, but if that is the way they feel, maybe it is better for there to be a completely French country in North America. That way we will get away from a lot of the—it is dividing Canada not only between English and French, but it is bringing up a lot of other issues.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

150

NORMAN SERRO

The Chair: Could I invite next Norman Serro.

Mr Serro: Members of the committee, Mr Chair, and the interpreters, it is true we now have a deaf MPP in Gary Malkowski and we all are bringing our concerns to him, and we bring our greetings. I know of many deaf natives in Ontario who live in the north and in all parts of the province. I met some when I was going to school. I feel the Ontario government must encourage deaf students to go to the deaf schools.

I would like to tell you about when I was a young boy, when I was in Caledon and I met a deaf man. I was very young, I was about 13, and we communicated by writing back and forth to each other. But what we needed to do was improve our literacy skills, and without those good literacy skills deaf people could not fill their potential upon graduation. A few years later my teacher told me I had to go to the Belleville School for the Deaf, but my mother was very upset when I went. She cried for a few days because I was being sent away to the provincial school, and she did not like the fact that we were going to be separated. Then my parents got me ready to go to school. They bought me clothes. We packed. Then I met the very same man I had met in Caledon previously. He recognized me and I recognized him, and he was a great influence and helped me.

I think the government should bring all deaf native people together and provide a school so they can preserve their own culture, so they can pass that on to future generations. I believe there are many deaf people in Ontario, but their parents are unable to teach them the deaf culture. A lot of parents see that deafness is equivalent to a mental handicap and it is not. The deaf people need to socialize with each other to be able to develop their pride in their own culture. There is a deaf man who came to my reserve east of here. He said he had never gone to school, that he

did not learn to read or write. He did not have that opportunity because his parents had no money. I told him that I did have that opportunity, but I started too late. That man had lost the opportunity to develop his potential. I would ask that the committee and the MPPs as they travel to their different towns listen to the deaf people and that they become as equals with the rest of the community. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Serro. There is one question.

Mr Malkowski: Would you just make mention of your descendancy?

Mr Serro: I am a descendant of Chief Joseph Brant.

SOCIAL PLANNING AND RESEARCH COUNCIL OF ST CATHARINES AND THOROLD

The Chair: Could I call next Janice Wiggins from the Social Planning and Research Council of St Catharines and Thorold?

Ms Wiggins: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Janice Wiggins, and on behalf of the Social Planning and Research Council of St Catharines and Thorold, I thank you for this opportunity to respond to the challenge of what lies ahead for our local communities, the province of Ontario and Canada as a whole in changing for the better.

An invitation to talk about a new Canada initiates dialogue about the type of country Canadians would like to have but also provides some thought-provoking examination about the needs and desires of everyday citizens in their local areas.

By working towards a common goal, the attainment of an appropriate quality of living for all is within reach in this country. The process to accomplish this is necessarily open to public participation and discussion. There are a great many issues which face Canada in the 1990s. Where do we envision ourselves in the next few years and further into the future? There is no one simple answer.

When we speak of views on the Constitution and Ontario's role in Confederation, there is a whole spectrum of goal-setting objectives and solutions to be considered. Given the nature of an organization such as the social planning council, most often the prevailing mandate is to plan for the wellbeing in indigenous communities.

With respect to the topic at hand, there are a number of intertwining variables in both the economic and social spheres. While our agency primary concern is the social arena, it would be remiss not to acknowledge the impact economic factors have upon social policy and indeed the wellbeing of citizens.

Recognizing that local communities are arranged throughout Ontario on an urban or rural basis, it is important to reiterate that particular arrangements affect local areas differently. For example, St Catharines is a medium-sized city with an industrial base and its neighbour Thorold is a smaller centre that relies upon industry as well. Within close proximity, our prime agricultural lands had helped to form the heart of Niagara's farming industry. The Niagara region as a whole comprises these two municipalities with an additional 10 others of various sizes. The relationship these geopolitical units have established at the regional

level in turn affects relationships with the upper tiers of government.

Despite the seemingly diversified nature of municipalities as a whole, there is one vital feature, that is, the residents of these localities have common links, particularly in relation to shared objectives, shared values and beliefs in programs that are evident across the country.

It has been suggested that Canadians share many factors, both tangible and symbolic. Pan-Canadian symbols such as the universal health care system, parliamentary government and so on serve as reminders that there are links across the country. Canadians at local levels enjoy universal and accessible health care system, access to education, freedom of choice for residence and various other factors in the country through an ongoing relationship and association between the provincial and federal governments.

Essentially, Canadians have needs such as adequate income, employment, housing and adequate social programs. If intergovernmental relations were to change via constitutional reform or some other mechanism, it is vital that all Canadians maintain and improve some of the standards that have currently been achieved or have been set as goals.

Before examining the social side of Ontario in Confederation, it is important to emphasize, as mentioned earlier, economic considerations. In general, Canadians are looking for security in employment. Ontario, with a visible emphasis on a heavy industrial base, is reflected in St Catharines and Thorold. The largest employer in the area is the auto industry, which indicates that economic arrangements from outside forces greatly affect the local community.

Economic goals in Ontario seem to differ from those in the rest of the country, due in part to the political economy of each region and the initial form in which each was set up. It is certainly appropriate to identify the place Ontario has in its own economic sphere as well as that of the rest of the country.

The paper produced by the Ontario government postulates that new forces will enable the creation of a commonwealth for the 21st century. This involves a critical re-examination of social values. A common desire to continue the provision of services to those in our society who are disadvantaged or deemed less fortunate must remain in the forefront.

During the 1980s, circumstances arose that led to the development of food banks across the country. In St Catharines and Thorold there is also an organization fulfilling the same service. It now seems that no community is immune to conditions that create reliance on other forms of assistance besides the government. Apparently, the need for developing these organizations transcends the immediate situation and indicates there are serious systemic crises in Canada.

In the end, the ultimate responsibility of looking after the needs of the disadvantaged also becomes the question of jurisdictional responsibility. Levels of government, in seeking resolution of constitutional issues, should also consider the implication and effects on all segments of society. There needs to be an attempt to preserve what has

been part of our heritage in this country, that is, a concern for our fellow citizens in all areas. What matters to Canadians in St Catharines and Thorold also matters to Canadians in Victoria and Dartmouth as well as points in between.

1200

A potential realignment of governmental responsibility may result from the re-examination of social values and norms in addition to an objective vision of Canada in the future. For the time being, it becomes necessary to enunciate problems that could jeopardize the social wellbeing of Canadians and further deepen some of the real and perceived gaps in this country.

It is increasingly evident in observing the social policy area that there are homeless and hungry in the nation. Where the larger question remains is how much of a burden is placed on Ontario, for example, to provide for the substantial needs of those individuals. Local municipalities too are greatly affected by policies created at other tiers of government.

A prime example is the federal government's introduction of Bill C-69, legislation designed to reduce expenditures in transfer payments. Ontario in particular is directly and immediately affected by the changes. Eventually, the brunt of this change in transfer payments is transferred back to the municipalities, which must provide services for citizens. Municipalities can least afford to assume the fiscal cost. The effects are too far-reaching, as there tends to be an even greater drain upon the social service and voluntary sector. The generosity of Canadians through these sectors has been traditionally a very strong component of the social nature of our country. These sectors have been said to be filling the gaps which result when public policy is not accommodating to everyone.

Canadians need assurances of equitable income distribution. Cost-sharing arrangements such as the established programs financing, or EPF, between Ontario and Ottawa ensure the opportunity for Ontarians to have access to the same standards and quality of living that appear as a guiding principle in policy decision-making.

Overlapping jurisdictions create some measure of concern, as the federal government has increasingly pulled back from financial support in these areas. It emerges and expands during the process of examining the Constitution and Ontario's role in Confederation and accountability for specific and overlapping areas.

The province is responsible for the deliverance of social programs. Certainly, there must be guarantees that individuals in receipt of these services are treated in an equitable fashion. Adherence to a set of enforceable standards should become a clear-cut goal of the province. A recent example includes the Social Assistance Review Committee report, better known as SARC, which proposes to streamline social assistance. However, part of the reality is that crucial moneys have been withheld in the form of transfer payments and have been threatened to be further reduced. This may stall an essential provincial initiative. It is difficult to reconcile the withholding of funds without a consensual agreement. Local municipalities in effect lose the ability to complete their portion of the arrangements, as

downloading of obligations is not accompanied by a concurrent array of financial assistance.

The whole issue of Confederation, Ontario's role and the Canadian Constitution requires a great deal of thought and discussion. Links that some Canadians see may not be compatible with the ideas of other Canadians. That is why a public process is essential so that citizens and organizations may voice their concerns in addition to their visions. While our document in particular provides points with regard to the social arena from a local perspective, the brevity of the response may be attributed to the short amount of time for preparation.

In closing, it is necessary for a perspective to be placed on the whole situation. It is the desire of Canadians to have a set of standards and clearly delineated responsibilities between the upper tiers of government. What must be assured is we examine conditions for moving into the 21st century with a quality of life that is acceptable to all Canadians.

Thank you again for allotting this time to the Social Planning and Research Council of St Catharines and Thorold to outline issues in the interests of social and economic aspirations. We have dealt with the first portion of the mandate from the select committee, and we trust that other parties will provide succinct information regarding the form of Confederation necessary to accomplish a future vision.

Thank you very much.

Mr Beer: Thank you very much for your submission. I think you have underlined a couple of very key problems as we look at the changes we would want to bring about.

I recognize this will probably be more of a personal answer than necessarily one from your organization. With all of the difficulties now around the cutting back of federal funds and then the impact that has on the province in terms of its funding to the local level, do you see some change in the way we fund social and health programs, whereby the province perhaps ought to take over greater direct responsibility either through the transfer of tax points—in other words, to have the ability to fund those—or do you think it is still necessary that the federal government control those dollars so there can be national standards? It seems we are caught all the time in that kind of dichotomy. What is your sense of that?

Ms Wiggins: I agree with you. We are caught in that conundrum of where the dollars came from, where the services came from, and what cutbacks are necessary in relation to proportionate cutbacks in funding. I think it is very difficult to have a quick answer, a ready answer. With the transfer payments and the current arrangement, it would require a great deal more thought, rearranging the fiscal arrangements that have occurred. If another base can be developed from somewhere that the province can control the money and not rely upon transfer payments, and in turn provide for the municipalities, that could well be possible, but there is only so much money in the economy to go around. That was my main sense of the whole situation, that there is only X number of dollars out there and to ask the taxpayers for more and more is very difficult. But you also recognize that social programs are vital.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Wiggins.

NORMAN WALPOLE

The Chair: Could I call next Norman Walpole.

Mr Walpole: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and committee. I appreciate this opportunity. I was unaware of the request for copies. I will look after that in the near future.

I am an area councillor from the city of Nanticoke and also president of the Norfolk NDP riding association. However, I am not speaking for either of those organizations. These viewpoints are solely my own.

I appreciate the fact that citizens are being asked for their views and that you are listening. I say this even though I believe that the best hope for a solution lies in a committee of constitutional experts studying alternatives, presenting the best options to our political leaders who could then demonstrate leadership to the nation on this issue.

We are a most blessed people, even though many of us do not realize it. Our country has an abundance of resources in great variety. We are potentially the finest nation on earth. We can thank Quebec for forcing us to face reality earlier. The issue is not much more Quebec than it is Alberta or New Brunswick. The issue is Canadianism, and the problem lies between the ears of Canadians. Canadians possess no consensus about what we want the future to bring. This lack of a sense of direction leaves us with a lack of confidence in ourselves. We do not know what options are available to us, nor do we understand the consequences of our decisions. We are a rudderless nation labouring in the shadow of our neighbour to the south.

To take a look at the history very briefly, people first came to Canada for furs, the beaver mainly. As time passed, land and other resources became a focus. After the revolutionary war, British immigrants looked to Canada for land because they wanted to be British loyalists and live under the monarchy. As time went on, living in a Commonwealth country became a priority for immigrants. Immigration from all corners of the globe has converted Canada into a more cosmopolitan nation where British influence is no longer a significant factor. Today, most citizens have a warm feeling about Canada, but we lack a clear consensus about why we exist as a separate entity.

I would like to talk briefly about some of the characteristics that many of us share. As a nation, we love our freedom and believe strongly in democratic government. We are a law-abiding people. We respect other people and usually are kind to them. We respect their property and have little desire to possess firearms. We respect the right of other countries to choose the kind of government they wish. We have been seen abroad as peacemakers and peacekeepers. We are largely a non-violent people. We believe in building social safety nets into our system to protect those who may be vulnerable to economic hardships or health problems.

1210

Canadians are strongly influenced by our neighbours to the south. Unless we are wary and protect our distinctive nature, we will be in danger of amalgamation. We have almost forgotten our distinctiveness in language in such

areas as the spelling of the words "colour," "labour," "centre," "light" and the fact that our last letter in the alphabet is pronounced zed.

We have arrived at a point where our teachers and the print media are part of the problem. The strongest cultural influence is television. Many of our children choose to watch programs from stations south of the border. As a result, they learn American spelling. They are more aware of the weather in Ashtabula than in Hamilton, Kitchener or London. They are more knowledgeable of American government processes than those in Canada and are more likely to know prominent Americans than to know prominent people in our own country. It bothers me that some Canadians see our sports, arts and entertainment as bush-league in comparison to those south of the border. I fear that we are losing our feeling of distinctiveness from Americans. If that should occur, political union cannot be far behind.

Canadians are reluctant nationalists. I recall being taken to the CNR station by my aunt in 1945 or 1946. I was a child of nine or 10 years. She furnished me with a flag to wave as the troops disembarked from the train. I felt too embarrassed to raise my arm high and wave the flag. I must confess that a residue of this feeling remains with me today and I suspect many Canadians feel likewise. Americans, on the other hand, are often rabid nationalists. Canadians could not possibly be rabid nationalists, nor may they want to be, but we would all benefit from being more demonstrative in our feelings of support for our country. We are lacking in cohesiveness as a nation. Our attitude needs to be, "All for one and one for all."

Instead of shopping for made-in-Canada items in our search for quality, we often consider price only. We need to purchase the items our neighbours produce, but with consideration for quality as well. It is a sad commentary on our attitude when some of us will pay a higher price for an inferior import. I am convinced that one of our institutions, the Consumers' Association of Canada, actually accentuates this trend to imports over domestic products.

Our nation is in great need of political leadership which possesses a sense of vision. I heard a reporter state once that he never felt more proudly Canadian than after having listened to a John Diefenbaker speech to high school students. While Lester Pearson was Prime Minister, Canadians saw our nation as world peacemakers and peacekeepers. I sat and listened to Tommy Douglas and wished that Canada could have experienced leadership which was so caring and possessed such a clear sense of vision for our nation.

Leadership which focuses on the Constitution or privatization or re-election or passing a particular piece of legislation at all costs is too narrow for our nation. It fails to provide the nation with a balanced leadership or a clear sense of direction. It also grovels in patronage appointments, which breed suspicion. The media proceeds to tar everyone with the same brush, and faith in politicians and the political process sinks to a critically low ebb.

I would like to speak briefly to the solution as I see it. Canada needs a strong central government in possession of all the powers necessary to lead the nation. Granting increasing powers to provinces is self-destructive appeasement.

That is not to say that reorganization of responsibilities from time to time is not appropriate. However, a situation which leaves a Prime Minister and a federal government almost powerless and at the mercy of premiers and provincial governments is a recipe for disaster and disintegration. The final result would be additional states joining our neighbours to the south.

When I erect a flag on my front lawn, there is a chance that it will be a provincial flag. I am a Canadian, am only incidentally an Ontarian. Quebec needs to be clear with us regarding its needs. If cultural security is a primary concern, we must be sensitive to this need and bend over backwards in order to accommodate those needs and allay their fears. I doubt that handing over numerous additional powers would be the solution. Goodwill and sensitivity are more likely to solve the problem, and that same goodwill and sensitivity must be granted to the first nations of this country as well. If Quebec decides it needs sovereignty, we had better reluctantly prepare for a bloodless divorce. I believe, however, that a separate Quebec would be more vulnerable to cultural demise than it would be inside an empathetic union of Canadian provinces.

If Quebec must leave, we must plan for a strong Canada with the remaining provinces and territories. The key to a strong country is strong leadership. Any of the three major parties is capable of providing what is needed. Voters must search out a sense of vision and a four- or five-year plan of action. Voters cannot allow parties to get away with a platform which is intended for campaign alone. Failure to provide leadership and accomplish stated goals should be grounds for electoral defeat. The media need to provide balanced coverage. Good deeds need fair exposure. Errors need to be pinned on the guilty and not overexposed to the point where the whole process falls into disrepute.

Cultural diversity needs to be portrayed as a strength. Multiculturalism and bilingualism are valid policies, but they will fall apart unless there are active steps taken to maintain their health. A strong program of education in our own cultural identity is necessary for a national sense of purpose. We need to see ourselves as different and being worthy of pride. Radio, television and print media may be required to carry vignettes that focus on historical events, national accomplishments, individual accomplishments, team achievements, institutions—whether they be hockey, the CFL, Grey Cup, winter carnival or whatever. I know one radio station runs stories on particular Canadians under the title of Successful Canadians. I know another one in Hamilton does something similar.

The Chair: Mr Walpole, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Walpole: Okay. I would like to see a commission that would be responsible for preparing those.

In conclusion, our choices are rather simple. We can believe in ourselves and support each other. In so doing we will be a strong and independent nation. If we do not, Quebec may be the first to leave, but others will follow. The eventual result will be a North America made up of six Latin American countries, Mexico, the United States with about 60 states, and a beleaguered Quebec suffering,

conomically at least as much as Newfoundland does now. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

220

EDDY WISEBLATT

The Chair: Could I invite next Eddy Wiseblatt.

Mr Wiseblatt: Good morning, everyone. Mr Chair and honourable committee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak to you. My name is Eddy Wiseblatt, and I am from central Ontario. After I speak to you, I would be happy to meet with you and answer any of your questions.

I work for Canada Post, and I have been there for the past 10 years. Currently, I am having difficulties with the post office; it began about a year ago. The Workers' Compensation Board turned me down, the reason being that we had miscommunication. I saw a posting at the post office with a phone number to contact the WCB, but it was for people who could hear; underneath that phone number there was a telecommunications device for the deaf telephone number. I called every day for 15 weeks, five days a week. I did that for three months, until finally I managed to get through to them. Then I had to make an appointment and I had to wait another month, so from the time I began to the time I finally got in there, it was four months later.

When I did go into WCB and tried to communicate with them, I had an interpreter with me. The interview was completed and the process went on. Approximately a year from the time I was hurt until I finally got a response; it was a year later. I was turned down. I do not understand why.

I had already spoken to some people who could hear, who had also been on workers' compensation, and guess what? There was a real big difference between them and myself, who is deaf. Someone who is hearing was able to get through right away, make an appointment immediately over the phone, and a month later had a response from WCB, whereas I had to wait approximately a year from start to finish.

My next point: Two weeks ago, for example, I wanted to contact the people at Canada pension plan because I needed information. It seems that for people who can hear it is easy to get the information, but not for people who are deaf. For example, I went into this CPP office, and the sign said you must make an appointment and it provided a phone number, so I went home and phoned. I called them through the Bell relay service because they did not have a TDD line. I could not get through; it took me a number of weeks. Finally I went into the office in person and explained, "I am deaf," etc, and the woman who was behind the front counter who worked at CPP said, "I have a private phone number, but we're not allowed to give you that private number." I explained my frustration and they said, "You have to phone and make an appointment." I said: "I told you I can't get through to you. I have been trying, and it isn't working." I said: "I have my number for you. Perhaps if you called a family member who wasn't deaf, someone like my mother who could speak to you."

So guess what happened the next day? The woman from CPP and my mother spoke immediately. The woman gave my mother the private phone number. I could not believe that. Why would that happen? Why would she not give it to me because I am deaf? I feel like a second-class citizen. She should have been ashamed of herself.

As I have worked for the post office for some time now, I have taken many courses to upgrade myself—for example, to become a supervisor, to become a manager, to get into management. At the post office, in my spare time, I took courses. I have passed every single course, every single one I have taken—many of them. The reason is that possibly I would want to be promoted to a supervisory position, but I am telling this committee that here in Ontario there are absolutely no deaf supervisors who work for Canada Post. Even though there are 60,000 employees who work for Canada Post, not one deaf individual has a supervisory position in Ontario.

What is wrong with Ontario? What is wrong with this province? At one time there was a supervisory position. I had taken many tests over the past five years and passed them all, and then a vacancy came up and I applied for the post. I spoke to the person who was responsible for running the competition. The way they behaved was almost like they felt sorry for me, like "you poor thing." They said to me that I had to do the tests again. What I am asking you people is what is wrong with Ontario? It is because I am deaf that I have been discriminated against.

Perhaps you may want to know why I want to be a supervisor. In the past, prior to working for Canada Post I had my own business. I owned a restaurant; I was an entrepreneur. I had the experience. I have good speech. I am deaf, that is all. I am able to speak to people. I could speak to people, I could act as a supervisor and speak to them one to one. But it always seems to be people who can hear. People look at me as if I have a deficit but there is nothing wrong with me.

We do have one deaf supervisor in Canada, in British Columbia. This individual is not born deaf, but a deafened person. They became deaf at the age of 12. I am a true culturally deaf person, and the person in BC is not.

I have a beautiful deaf family. I have a deaf wife who works for family services counselling in Milton. I have sons. One is 21 and he is deaf, and he is attending a deaf university in the United States. A second son is also deaf, who attends a school for the deaf in Milton. We are all deaf. We are a wonderful family.

All of my life, even with my restaurant experience, etc, I am able to listen to people—people who are deaf, who have difficulties, who maybe go to the Canadian Hearing Society or to church or whatever and have given up on these agencies or people come to me. I have an open door policy at my home. I am always welcoming those individuals who are having difficulties, and I listen to them.

Now you, the MPPs for Ontario, have this committee and have been meeting for almost a month. You have heard from deaf individuals across the province on a variety of issues, but I want to tell you that you are missing something. I have listened to individuals and I keep hearing this term Ombudsman. I think what that means is someone

who listens well. Someone who is hungry for something or is getting frustrated or whatever would go to an Ombudsman. I am talking about problems with the school system, the educational system, the Canadian Hearing Society. I think what you need to do is hire a provincial human rights worker, someone who is deaf and French, someone who can work with human rights, who can work here in the province. There is a person by the name of Judy Rebick. She does a lot of work, but she has basically taught breaking down barriers to people. Here in Ontario we need a deaf person to do the same kind of thing, someone to stand behind us and provide services for us.

Truly, in my heart, I have gone to northern Ontario and experienced what goes on there, and I fully support the aboriginal people there. What I suggest to you, I beg of you, is please hire a deaf native person who can act as a human rights social worker, whatever, because in my experience, and I am 46 years of age, I have met two individuals who left and then came back and there were three deaf natives who had committed suicide and one person died. That is an awful lot of money for Ontario. I do not understand it.

I terms of deaf education, the system itself—

1230

The Chair: Mr Wiseblatt, if you could sum up please, we are at the end of the time.

Mr Wiseblatt: All right then. I am just on my last page here, if I may.

I ask of you, as I have said before, that for the deaf educational system, I feel we must hire deaf social workers, deaf psychologists, deaf counsellors; everyone should be deaf. The purpose of that is that I am informing you the committee that we the deaf Ontarians are very happy to have an MPP such as Gary Malkowski. Why I have said all of these things is because it would benefit you, as hearing individuals, and deaf people. It is true deaf people should be hired because they are the only ones who really understand what deafness is all about. They can communicate. They understand the difficulties that people have experienced at school and they can truly relate.

I do thank the committee for allowing me this opportunity.

JOANNA BEDARD

The Chair: The final speaker is Joanna Bedard.

Ms Bedard: Elders, chiefs, Mr Chairman and committee members, I am speaking from a few notes I made this morning, but I have not had any time other than this morning to prepare, and unfortunately I am not like John Peters who can just get up and speak to any group on any subject from his heart.

Mr Peters: The gift of the gab, it is called.

Ms Bedard: I think in first nations' society the men have the gift of the gab and not the women.

First nations have been involved in the formation of the society of this country from the time when humanity emerged from the mists of time. It is our story that the first nations have occupied this territory from the dawn of time and this has not been refuted by science. In fact recent

scientific archaeologists have located evidence that perhaps tiny forebear of humanity was at one time extant on this continent. The Bering Strait theory is only that, developed first to accommodate biblical notions and then to affirm the notion of a citizenry of immigrants.

First nations are not immigrants but are the children of the Creator, serving and surviving at the beneficence of Mother Earth on Turtle Island. Therefore, first nation must be considered a founding nation with a distinct place in North American and Canadian society.

The 53 different cultural and linguistic groups which exist in Canada are unique to this country. Through a policy of assimilation and repression, many of those cultures and languages are on the verge of extinction. Once we in Canada abandon this precious heritage, it cannot be retrieved or revitalized elsewhere. Therefore, recognizing that obligations to first nations lie within the federal jurisdiction, but also recognizing the great influence which the province of Ontario has within Confederation, we ask you, Premier, Mr Rae, to work within the sphere of his influence to ensure that the human and political rights of first nations are protected and affirmed by the Constitution.

Political self-government systems as ancient as any in existence today were in practice within this territory. While currently suppressed, they can emerge within a pluralistic society such as Canada. These governments are consensual in nature, provide for the emergence and identification of the individual from within the definition of the collective, nation, respect the environment, recognize the interdependency of all created things, and respect an equality of privacy among the human and the non-human. They integrate the recognition of spirituality within the individual and society, regard education as a cradle-to-grave enterprise, celebrate and respect elders, and welcome the young as our greatest resource and commitment to the future.

First nations best function within their own self-government and within the Constitution and resourced by a share of the great wealth of this nation which they have shared with settler governments and newer immigrants. The Constitution must ensure the rightful place of first nation within the Canadian polity. As well, it must recognize and support first nations' languages and cultures. It must address the damage done by forced assimilation practices in the past.

The healthy, active and developing practice of self-government within first nations will address the issue of justice and human rights as opposed to the imposition of foreign, legalistic, legal system where the rule of law is manipulated and interpreted by and for the powerful.

If we as peoples are committed to peace in the world and the recognition of human rights, it is necessary to hold and practise these goals in this country and in this Constitution by which it is governed.

First nations have been speaking to settler governments for the past 500 years. They have spoken of the importance of the environment, of the economy, of the needs of women and children, of the needs of the elderly, of the needs for people living within spirituality and of mutual respect.

The most important treaty among the nations is one which John Peters mentioned this morning, the two-row wampum. It is written in the ancient language of the Ongwehongweh people. It is beaded, it is a belt, it shows two rows of purple beads separated by three rows of white beads, and it says, "We will progress as nations along the same river, each in our own canoe, respecting in friendship the rights of each other."

Perhaps Canada should take a lesson from the first nations and develop its own two-row wampum. Let us progress together in peace, respect and friendship, each in our own canoe. Let us sail down the river of time together.

I would also ask on behalf of our brothers and sisters, the Cree and the Inuit in Quebec, if Mr Rae, your Premier, would find the information for us on the 1912 agreement which gave the administrative powers to Quebec for the northern portion of that province, that northern portion which Mr Bourassa is damming up so his people in the south can benefit from these resources and leave our Cree brothers and sisters with nothing, which will extinguish their whole way of life. If Quebec wants to separate and the Cree want to stay within the Canadian polity, what are Mr Rae and Mr Mulroney going to do about that?

The first nations of this country love their land. The people regard Turtle Island as their mother, the very earth of which they are made, flesh of their flesh and blood of their blood. If others do not so regard this land, then let them give it back. I challenge you, in the words of one of your own poets from one of the founding nations:

Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Bedard. I think it is a fitting end to the presentations this morning. Yes, we can take a couple of quick questions.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much for your presentation. I was very moved, as I think we all were, by your last statement. I wanted to know if you had any specific suggestions on how—you mentioned that Mr Rae and our government might try to intervene in some way in the James Bay project. I wanted to know if you had any specific suggestions on how we might work together to deal

with that situation. I guess my bias is showing. I agree with you and I think it needs to be stopped. I just do not know at this point, because it is in Quebec territory, how to deal with that.

Ms Bedard: if we look on this as our country and if we look at any action taken, it is interdependent. In other words, if he changes the whole of Mother Earth in his area, it is going to affect us. It is going to affect James Bay. It is going to affect the rivers in our portion of the country. It is going to affect us all. If our brothers and sisters in northern Quebec are left with no means of existence, they say, "Well, let them have welfare," and then five years down the road they are going to say, "Look at all those Indians up there living on welfare." It never stops. Every time there is any resource anywhere in this country that is on Indian territory, as soon as the non-native population wants to make money from it, it does not matter; they take it.

But the repercussions for everybody living in this country is the same. When the resources are abused, we all pay for it. And why are we doing it? We are not even doing it for ourselves. We are doing it for another country. We are doing it for Americans. We are not even doing it for the people there; we are doing it for the multinationals.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Bedard.

Ms Bedard: Before you close, Mr Chairman, it is our custom that nobody leaves this territory or this centre without a little gift. It is the culture of the Ongwehongweh people to share, and so on behalf of our centre and the nations we represent, we would like to make a small presentation to you.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We have appreciated the hospitality here and your comments.

On that note, we will end our stay here in Brantford. We proceed this afternoon as a committee to Hamilton where we will conclude our hearings for this week. We invite those people here and those that are watching over the parliamentary channel to continue to follow our proceedings if you are so interested. Thank you very much. We are recessed.

The committee recessed at 1244.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1517 at McMaster University, Hamilton.

The Chair: If I can call the meeting to order, my name is Tony Silipo, Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are pleased as a committee to be here in Hamilton this afternoon for an afternoon and evening of hearings, this being the final stop for us this week and this being the third week of a four-week cycle of meetings in various parts of the province to get a sense from the people of the province, through individuals and organizations, of the kinds of views that people have about the future of the country and the province's role in the new Confederation.

We have heard to date a number of interesting and fascinating viewpoints, and no doubt we will hear from the speakers this afternoon and this evening a number of additional comments that will be useful to all of us in proceeding with the many issues that we have before us.

As we have done in a number of other locations, in addition to the printed list of speakers we have a number of other people we would like to try to accommodate. I will ask that speakers try to keep their comments to 10 minutes if they are individuals and to 20 minutes if they are representing organizations. If you could allow some flexibility within that for time for questions for the committee members, we find that that is also a useful exchange for us.

SHEILA COPPS

The Chair: I will call our first speaker, Sheila Copps.

Ms Copps: Thank you, Mr Chairman, for the privilege of being here. As one who obviously has an elected as well as a non-elected interest in the survival of our country, I am really glad that the Ontario legislative committee has chosen to hear from us, because you may know that the Spicer commission wants to hear from individual Canadians and members of French political parties but not from any of the established political parties, which include the NDP, Liberals and Conservatives. So this is my one kick at the can.

I felt it was important for me to speak here in Hamilton because I do think that we are facing a very important choice and your committee is going to play a crucial role. The constitutional clock is ticking and we have two choices. We can either sleepwalk our way to separation or we can seek a national consensus to rebuild Canada. Ontario, your legislative committee and our province have a key role to play in that consensus. Your work will largely determine whether, as Ontarians, we can help kickstart a failing federalism. Make no mistake about it: the time is short. To reshape our future, I think we must all understand Canada's past.

Le Canada est constitué de quatre composants. Au début il était habité par divers peuples autochtones. Aujourd'hui, il compte environ un demi-million de citoyens partagés entre plusieurs nations. Ayant vécu sur ces terres depuis plusieurs dizaines de milliers d'années, ils ont acquis une profonde connaissance de notre riche nature et ont appris à

la fois à en vivre et à la respecter. Malheureusement, au cours de ces derniers siècles, les nouveaux arrivants, nous compris, ont parfois oublié de les inclure en bâtissant le Canada.

La première vague d'immigrants est venue de France principalement au cours de la décennie de 1680. En vertu d'une décision politique du cardinal de Richelieu, tous les colons français devaient être catholiques. Au moment de la conquête en 1760, ils étaient 60 000 habitants. Tous les six millions de Canadiens français vivent aujourd'hui comme descendants de ceux-ci. Il est donc facile à comprendre pourquoi le peuple français du Canada est si homogène et «tricoté serré». Le fait qu'il a survécu et qu'il a bâti une société originale et forte est une preuve de sa vitalité.

The second wave of immigrants was of British origin. It started with the coming of the Loyalists, already North Americans for a few generations but loyal to the British crown. They were soon to be followed by other people coming from the British islands, like my foreparents from Ireland, mainly during the 19th century. Their descendants now count for about nine million Canadians. Because of the conquest, the country belonged to them. They settled primarily in the Maritimes, southwestern Quebec and Ontario, and built the infrastructure and the industry of central and eastern Canada.

In spite of an uneasy relationship with French Canadian, they founded, together with French Canadians, the Dominion of Canada in 1867. The Confederation was a collective decision by the two founding peoples, French and English, to build a country together. It was designed as a federation, not a unitary state, to allow the French to have control of government. As for the French, Confederation, and indeed Canada as we know it, has always been a pact between the two founding peoples.

The third wave of immigrants, and one about which we are particularly proud in Hamilton, started after the birth of Canada at the end of the 19th century and is still going strong today. Coming first from all European countries and now from all over the world, they want to live in and contribute to one of the most blessed lands on earth. Accounting now for nine million Canadians, they have literally opened, settled and built the west, as well as enriched our metropolitan cities.

Because of this extraordinary gathering of different and intertwined groups of people, Canada has a chance to be a microcosm of humanity. Each of these groups—aboriginal peoples, francophones, anglophones, multicultural groups—enriches our country by bringing its specific skills and experiences. Some of these characteristics are the aboriginal peoples contributing ancient wisdom rooted in a unique environment. This knowledge is particularly relevant in the environmental crisis we face today.

Les Français apportent leur sens aigu de la nature et l'identité canadienne. Grâce à leur double expérience comme Nord-Américains mais résistant à l'assimilation continentale, grâce à leurs racines profondes et parce qu'ils ont eu à vivre à la fine pointe de l'histoire et l'évolution

politique du pays, ils savent très clairement ce que ça signifie d'être Canadiens. Ils n'ont pas de problème d'identité de cette fameuse angloise canadienne répandue chez nous, les Canadiens anglais.

The British contribute their sense of stability. Having built our political institutions, the British parliamentary system is the basis of our democracy. They have shaped the nature of our political life. Having brought the capital and expertise, they have shaped economic and financial infrastructures.

Canadians from other origins bring variety and richness that help our modern country in this global village to face the challenge of living as a single human community on a small planet. Canada is one of the few countries in the world where we find people who have direct personal relationships with every other country on earth. Because it was founded on a pact between the French and the English, Canada is blessed by being the home of two important original languages. Montreal is probably the only city in the world that has a comprehensive school system from primary grades to post-secondary studies in English and French.

Évidemment, une telle diversité crée des problèmes et on en vit actuellement. Les consensus sont déjà difficiles dans les sociétés homogènes comme les états-nations de l'Europe. Au Canada, parfois nos différences semblent insurmontables à cause de la barrière linguistique, des barrières entre régions, de la barrière entre les autochtones et les autres, des barrières entre les Canadiens de vieille souche et les nouveaux arrivants et ainsi de suite. L'ordre semble s'écrouler. Le Québec actuellement se sent rejeté par le reste du Canada. L'Ouest aussi se sent aliéné par la mainmise du Canada central sur le système fédéral. Les autochtones sont aigris parce qu'ils ont été ignorés. Les Maritimes se sentent isolées à cause de leur éloignement et de leur faiblesse économique.

Our system, designed in the 19th century, no longer seems to be able to answer 21st-century needs. The present structures and institutions are not adapted to deal with the new realities. Federalism is a complex system designed to deal with complex situations. When the situation changes, so must the specifics of our federal system. In Chinese, the ideogram for crisis means danger and opportunity. Perhaps we can use this constitutional crisis as an opportunity to build a new deal for Canada. We must focus on a new deal for all of Canada because as long as the Constitution is looked upon as merely a Quebec problem, the issue of national unity will not be resolved.

One of the mistakes of Meech was that it dealt exclusively with Quebec's demands. Other Canadians felt left out of the process and thus thought, rightly or wrongly, that it was unfair. This time let us take the opportunity to renegotiate a new deal for Canada. In 1864 the Fathers (only) of Confederation faced an almost impossible task, yet they succeeded in providing the frame to build an extraordinary country that has lasted for 123 years. Why can we not now, you sitting around this table and other Canadians, succeed in providing a new framework for 123 more years in Canada? Why can you not be the fathers and mothers of a new confederation?

More than any other country in the world, Canada is the creation of the strong will of our people. Our country was created in spite of geographic obstacles, our mixture of different peoples within common institutions and our proximity to a powerful and at times overbearing neighbour. The great majority of Canadians, and I believe Quebecers, do not want to destroy Canada, but they need to reshape it. Quebecers are putting their ideas on the table in a very articulate and comprehensive manner, and we across the rest of the country are only now waking up to the scope of the possible changes.

We may not like the specifics of some of the Quebec proposals. Then we must make counterproposals. Why not take this danger opportunity to look at other areas of dissatisfaction? What about regional alienation and aboriginal claims? What about Senate reform? Dialogue leads to creative thinking. We need to overcome our differences and realize what we have in common. History and geography have brought us together on the northern part of America. This is our home on earth and we must find a formula to rewrite the Canadian equation. The role of Ontario is critical in rewriting this equation.

Historically the names Robarts, Davis and Peterson have been at the centre of all constitutional discussions over the last 30 years. This is a role that Premier Bob Rae must not relinquish. He must add his name to those nation-builders from our province who have understood that our role in Confederation must surpass self-interest. That is not to say that Ontario's desire for a united Canada is totally selfless. The notion put forth by some that the Ontario economy will remain strong in a fractured Canada does not stand up to scrutiny. The value of trade between Ontario and Quebec is near \$20 billion. This represents 400,00 jobs.

Beyond its value, its quantity, our economic ties with Quebec are also important qualitatively. Businesses are closely integrated and each market has an intimate knowledge of the other. Our partnership provides more secure markets than most other economic relationships. To those who say, "Let Quebec go, its price is too high," I say the price for separation is much higher for all of us. To those who say the breakup of this country is just a matter of time, I say no, we can reignite the political will to reach out now and save this country. To those who would sleepwalk us to separation by ignoring the constitutional crisis and focusing only on our economic problems, I say a strong economy and a strong Constitution go hand in hand. We cannot have a healthy Ontario without a whole Canada and we cannot have a complete Canada unless we undergo a fundamental restructuring of the way we share power in this country.

1530

Le Québec a besoin de croire qu'il est autant désiré que les autres parties du Canada. Paradoxalement, le sentiment d'aliénation et d'éloignement de la force politique du centre du Canada qu'éprouvent les Québécois est partagé par d'autres Canadiens dans l'Ouest et dans les Maritimes.

Quebec is not the only province that feels left out of the Canadian equation. Travel to the Maritimes, travel to the west and hear Canadians who feel that they are left out

of the new constitutional deal. Quebec wants to believe it is wanted and it is needed in the same way as other Canadians. Ironically its sense of alienation and distance from the centre of Canadian political force is shared by many other parts of the country.

Quebec is clearly a distinct society within Canada. This fact must be recognized in the Constitution if any sense of Quebecers belonging to our country is to be restored. But the constitutional crisis is not only a Quebec problem. It is a crisis of empowerment for all Canadians. This is about allowing all the people, not just a privileged few, to have a say in the decisions that shape their lives. Like Quebecers, other Canadians too want to be masters in their own house. When all the layers of politics are peeled away and many of us around this table have spent many years peeling political layers, elements of Quebec's constitutional proposals deal with the very issue of power to the people.

In the debate over division of powers that undoubtedly must ensue, let's examine what can best be delivered by each government. It makes sense that provinces have responsibility for manpower training because the closer you are to the needs of the population, the better you can understand regional and local manpower needs. On that other hand, it makes sense that the federal government has some jurisdiction in environmental matters because pollution ignores provincial boundaries. What we throw into Lake Ontario here in Hamilton eventually finds its way into the St Lawrence waterway, and we are inextricably linked.

On the other hand, it is only natural that Quebec controls the linguistic and cultural policies that affect its capacity to remain a francophone partner in the Canadian family. Instead of allowing the constitutional debate to tear this country apart, we should be focusing on the elements that can and should bring us together: interprovincial movement of goods, services and people from sea to sea to sea. Your committee can focus on strengthening elements that deal with interprovincial relations. Is it not about time that we practise free trade among Ontario, Quebec and the rest of Canada? Listen to Allaire on that point. Does it not seem absurd that beer brewed in New Brunswick can be purchased in Florida but cannot be bought in Ontario? These are economic challenges that, if resolved, will make us stronger, not weaker.

D'où vient cette idée qu'en donnant plus de pouvoir au Québec nous nous affaiblissons ? Pourquoi croyons-nous qu'en donnant l'autodétermination aux autochtones, le reste d'entre nous perdons ? Est-ce que renforcer les régions affaiblit vraiment le tout ? Dans une famille, plus ses membres sont forts et autonomes, plus la cellule familiale est renforcée en enrichie. Dans un mariage, lorsqu'un époux appuie son conjoint, lui donne de l'amour, cet époux gagne, il ne perd pas et le couple s'en trouve renforcé. Une équation semblable gouverne les communautés humaines.

A new contract, a new constitution, in which each partner feels at home can only lead to a stronger Canada. It is important to keep the dialogue open. It will be painful, it will demand courage, yet it must be fruitful. The diversity of our country is an important asset that will help us to face the reality of years to come. The only chance for

Canada to be at the leading edge of nations in the global village of the 21st century is to be open to the world. I hope my daughter speaks not only English and French but Italian and all the other languages that have helped enrich our culture and opened us to the world of the 21st century.

The main task of your committee is to find a way to translate this diversity into a creative working relationship and to allow each of our citizens to feel that they are a part of this great country. Ontario is in a unique position. As a major partner in Confederation, we have a real stake in a united Canada. As the closest geographic and economic neighbour, we are the oldest friend of Quebec. We have also been a bridge between east and west. In this new context Ontario must play a key role in defining and shaping a new deal for Canada.

I hope that your committee will fully understand the urgency of thought and action. We owe it to future generations of Canadians. I wish you Godspeed in your deliberations and I would be very happy to answer any questions.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Copps. Certainly we understand the urgency as well as the importance of the work that is before us and some of the things you have mentioned. We are running a bit behind, but I will allow one or two quick questions.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you very much for your presentation. Actually, before I ask my question, I would like to state that it touched me very much, because I am originally from Hamilton and I grew up in your riding, so I feel quite honoured being able to ask you the first question.

With regard to the Constitution, you seem to be emphasizing the importance of the recognition of native, francophone, anglophone and multiculturalism. However, there is no mention of disability rights nor women's rights. With Meech Lake, this was disregarded as well. Could you comment on the absence of these?

My second question is with regard to the Allaire report. What do you feel this committee should consider out of those 22 recommendations that might be vital to us for our consideration?

Ms Copps: I will start with the second question first. I think the checklist or shopping list of responsibilities that has been outlined in Allaire is not really the sum and substance of the essence of the report. I think the essence of the report we should be looking at is the element dealing with the economic integration of all of the parts of Canada, in particular Ontario and Quebec. I think it is one area where we share the views of Quebec, that we need to break down provincial barriers and we have to open Canada up so that Canadians can live and work in the language of their choice from sea to sea to sea.

With respect to your first question, I believe the instruments, including the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Ontario Human Rights Code, which I was privileged to be involved in the reworking of in 1982, do serve as a tool to protect as much as possible the interests of particular groups and individuals. I see great strength in the Canadian Human Rights Act in defining, for example, the recourse from discrimination that can be sought by women and in particular by handicapped persons.

I did not specifically deal with women or handicapped persons as a representative of a particular perspective, because I was looking at demographic groups. When I did the analysis of the peoples who have brought us together, I was looking more at the issue of geographic country of origin than gender or physical or mental handicap. But I do believe there are tools in place—both need strengthening at the provincial and national level—that can also be utilized, in part as a result of the Constitution and in part as a tool of the Canadian Human Rights Act.

To sort of get into the remaking of the Meech argument, I made a reference in my brief to the fact that I felt one of the reasons that Meech failed is because it was an attempt to redress the grievances of the absence of Quebec in the Canadian Constitution but it did not deal with a number of other grievances. Clearly those other grievances have to be explored in a new constitutional round if all Canadians are going to get some kind of a consensus and come to a conclusion.

1540

Mr Offer: Thank you, Sheila, for your presentation. It might be interesting for you to know that as we have travelled through the province, a great many people share the passion of Canada and the great desire to try to find an accommodation so that this country remains united.

Right now there is potentially some ongoing negotiation between Quebec and the federal government. You have spoken in your presentation about the role of Ontario. On one hand you have spoken about the role Ontario should play, yet on the other hand we sense potential ongoing negotiations between the federal government and one province. How do you see those two coming together? How do the other provinces take a part in this type of ongoing discussion?

Ms Coppes: First you have to consider the fact that six months ago Quebec was not talking to anybody and now it is talking to the federal government on some specific issues. The immigration agreement that was signed is one. There are going to be other areas of preliminary discussion. Obviously, when push comes to shove and the final new deal is struck for Canada—if there is to be a new deal struck for Canada—that is going to have to be struck by more than one province and the federal government. There will have to be major constitutional consensus. That is one of the reasons that right now the federal parliamentary committee is looking at the issue of the amending formula, because of course one of the reasons for the difficulty in getting any kind of consensus on Meech was the fact that when you need unanimity as a precondition for amendment, that makes it very difficult.

The second point that I made—God forbid that I should come to the committee and say I want to be non-partisan, but I do say that, because I think it is important in this debate that we not wear our party hats. I understand the political dilemma the Premier faces, that at the moment the focus of attention of many thousands of Ontarians is on jobs. That, combined with the difficulties that former Premier Peterson faced in terms of the perception that his constitutional position cost him dearly, there could be a

tendency to want to move away from questions of the Constitution in our province. I think it is important that the Premier get the support of all Ontarians to make the links between the economy and the Constitution and also to ensure that Ontario can play a role in bringing this country together, because I think we have historically done that in the past. That is why I mentioned Robarts, and you can go back to Pepin-Robarts and you can look at the work of Mr Davis and Mr Trudeau in the early Constitution. I was sitting in the opposition in Ontario at the time and at times we sort of gritted our teeth about this rather unholy alliance, but when you are talking about the future of your country I think it is important that you throw off your party mantles and you try and do what you can to keep it together.

I think a lot of people would like to ignore the economic arguments for Ontario to have a strong constitutional position. I do not think we can ignore them. I think they are there, they are very real, and those people in my own community, and I dare say probably a few in this room, who say, "To heck with Quebec, let them go," are making a big mistake, because if they do go the price will be paid by all of us.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Coppes.

MONARCHIST LEAGUE OF CANADA

The Chair: Could I call next John Aimers from the Monarchist League of Canada.

Mr Aimers: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I am accompanied today by Garry Toffoli, who is the chairman of our Toronto branch.

I am delighted to have the opportunity of addressing the committee today in order to briefly outline the views and concerns of the Monarchist League of Canada, spelled out in more detail in the brief submitted to you.

The league is Canada's only organization whose sole purpose is to explain the role and benefits of constitutional monarchy to Canadians and to correct misinformation and misunderstanding about the crown in Canada on the part of the press, politicians or the public. We have about 16,000 members across the Dominion, 40% of that figure living here in Ontario.

Contrary to the image sometimes foisted on monarchists, we are a young organization, representative of the Canadian identity, diverse in our backgrounds and politics, bilingual and multicultural in our approach. We are proud of the crown as a thoroughly Canadian institution, and our whole approach to our work is in a Canadian context. We are not sentimental wavers of the Union Jack or romantic absolutists and we specifically repudiate those individuals and organizations who sometimes wrap themselves in the cloak of loyalty to the monarchy as a cover for bigotry based on language, race or religion.

Canadians today suffer from political fatigue and from the clamorous demands of a host of special-interest groups. Who addresses the needs of the country as a whole? One key element, we believe, that should not be overlooked in the discussion is the monarchy, which incarnates the particular values of society in a subjective way quite apart from its objective value in a constitutional sense.

One is only to have experienced the galvanizing effect on a voluntary association of an impending royal visit, for instance, to see this principle at work, helping to construct society and to unify the country in a manner that has nothing to do with the provision of government services.

Proper understanding of one's past can sustain one in the present and provide direction for the future. One of the current trends that has added unnecessary heat and intolerance to our debates across Canada is the assumption that our differences can be resolved by repudiating our historic institutions, and as such repudiations are a sign of national maturity. This notion rewrites history to present Canada as the victim of successive imperialisms—French, English and American—labels its opponents as suffering from colonial hangups, and suggests this remedy, that true Canadians demand the eradication of our military traditions, royal associations with voluntary societies and any evidence of monarchy in public life, leaving as little as possible in the history books.

In this context, French Canadians are represented as the people suffering from the ills of an 18th-century conquest and Quebec's position as analogous to that of other nations struggling for liberation from an imperial power. Our brief dismembers these fallacies in some detail, pointing out to you another view of Canadian history, less revolutionary but more realistic, and reminding us how much of the evolution of so-called English political institutions owes to French culture and government.

In drawing attention to Canada's monarchical heritage, we are not saying anything about the domination of one ethnic group by another. Indeed, we would deprecate any attempt to do so. What we are speaking about is the institutionalization by our society of civilizing values that create the public environment for not only the administration of government but of all public activities. Those who persist in referring pejoratively to the Queen as the Queen of England are either ignorant of the Canadian Constitution and Canadian history or are consciously making a misleading statement.

The Queen has many crowns and many capitals. She is not resident in Canada, but is the Governor General resident in Newfoundland or the American President in New York? Sharing the Queen with kindred societies in a high-tech, easily communicated world, in a diverse Commonwealth, is one way by which Canadians can demonstrate their ability to get along with other societies and show the world that we see ourselves as part of a larger family.

The living values of monarchy, as opposed to its political and constitutional benefits, essential to Canadian unity, rest essentially on the recognition of the worth of others. Many other values flow from this paramount one: piety, tolerance, amity, manners, decency, the family. Recognition of others therefore lies at the heart of monarchical sovereignty, in contrast to the wearying assertion and reassertion of the self, of me and my demands and my needs that is characteristic of popular sovereignty. If understood properly, monarchy short-circuits the lack of care for the general good on the one hand and hate propaganda on the other by shrinking the heads of egoists. The Queen's picture on our walls and stamps and coins is, in another sense,

the best headshrinker, reminding popular leaders that they are not the state but its temporary custodians. It is best that power be separated from the externals of glory. This is one of the services monarchy has to offer democracy.

The monarchist perspective of Canada provides specific concepts in addressing our present difficulties. These we have suggested in our brief under headings political, social and symbolic. One point anchors them all, that Canada should remain an evolutionary society, recognizing the partnership of the ages. Quick, revolutionary fixes will not save Canada but destroy its very character. The most successful societies adapt old institutions and principles to new requirements, just as our parliamentary monarchy has adapted successfully to feudal, Renaissance, mercantile, agricultural, industrial and now post-industrial societies successively.

So we believe our political institutions are sound and should be maintained essentially in their present form, with changes in the form of modifications to meet some new expressions of old and true concepts.

1550

Key to all our expectations and a matter of particular concern, I would imagine, to any provincial committee studying the Constitution, is education. As a teacher, I am grieved in travelling around the province and the country to find an incredible amount of ignorance on the part of high-school students and those who have recently graduated from high school about the facts behind our form of government. One thing that our American cousins have certainly been able to do successfully, and a factor that surely lies behind their national cohesiveness, is to inculcate in their children a thorough knowledge of the American system of government, a deep respect for its founding fathers and a profound reverence for its national symbols, the flag, allegiance. It is to the discredit of our education system, hugely funded and built, that we have failed to train teachers to teach children a similar deep-rooted and near-universal pride in our land and its institutions and symbolism.

That such sharing of values does not eliminate dissent and free thinking is patently evident. That is does knit together a fabric less inclined to unravel in times of stress is equally obvious. "Get you the sons your fathers got," the British poet A. E. Housman wrote on the occasion of Victoria's golden jubilee, "and God will save the Queen." As a monarchist, if there is one thing I would do to save our country it would be just that: to create, teach and maintain from grade 1 through the end of high school a program of national history and symbolism and identity that would be unabashedly proud, unashamedly traditional and uncompromisingly Canadian.

Also, we believe the sovereignty of the Queen and Parliament must be maintained by ensuring that the seeds of judicial autocracy do not flower. Accordingly, we must preserve the "notwithstanding" clause in respect to charter rights. The flexibility that is the genius of monarchy, to adapt to varying needs and circumstances, could be employed by giving consideration of mechanisms by which our transnational communities, French-speaking, aboriginal, for instance, which exist coast to coast and are not limited to reserves or a single province, could be given a voice or

governmental structure other than that through a central or provincial government. Similarly, we ask whether federal or provincial constituencies might well be redefined to allow a more accurate reflection of modern communities as seen by the people who belong to them.

The monarchy not only gives prestige to the central government but also to the provincial governments. A Governor General can only be a figure of the central government. The Queen, however, transcends and encompasses both central and provincial governments, giving each equal authority and prestige in their fields of jurisdiction. Indeed, in Regina in 1978, all 10 premiers in supporting the role of the sovereign, stated, "Provinces agree that the system of democratic, parliamentary government requires an ultimate authority to ensure its responsible nature and to safeguard against abuses of power." That ultimate power must not be an instrument of the federal cabinet.

We believe that the Queen, and not her Dominion representative, the Governor General, should appoint provincial Lieutenant Governors directly on provincial advice. To enhance the prestige and neutrality of these vice-regal appointments, such advice should be made in the form of shortlists so that the incumbents are clearly Her Majesty's own choice. Generous use of the crown, the royal sceptre and other symbols reflecting our pride in the monarchy should be made—in Ontario, for instance, the trillium surmounted by a crown when the coat of arms is not used. Provinces should have the right, hitherto denied, to have provincial honours officially sanctioned by the Queen. We go on to make other specific recommendations in the brief submitted to you.

In conclusion, the league stresses that Canada is difficult to define as a country because it is the product of history rather than of academic fantasies or the ideology of social engineers. Such a country requires flexibility for its institutions and this flexibility is best found in a monarchy and through a largely unwritten Constitution. Attempts to provide new or fully written constitutions are counterproductive, as proven both in 1982 and in the Meech Lake proposals, for the proposed definitions of Canada become roadblocks to achieving the goodwill behind the concepts.

With improved education and a vigorous use of the monarchy as a proud boast of a rejuvenated Canadian identity, the monarchical principles and institutions of this country remain flexible enough to accommodate the legitimate aspirations of all Canadians, as individuals and as communities, within the sovereignty of the Queen of Canada. As Her Majesty said in 1982, worth remembering today, "The strength of Canada's Constitution lies not in the words it contains, but in the foundation upon which it rests; the desire of the people of Canada that their country remain strong and united."

Thank you very much, Mr Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Aimers.

Mr Winninger: I was interested in your comments about the written versus the unwritten Constitution. I gather you know that our written Constitution Act of 1982 has been described by one commentator as a living tree, something organic and capable of growth and change. So I

would ask you, does it matter whether a Constitution is written or not, provided it is sufficiently flexible that it can meet the changing needs of society?

Mr Aimers: Our preference would always be for the traditions of an unwritten Constitution, because the minute you start trying to spell out every possibility that might arise, every scenario that could develop, I think you simply prove the fallibility of words and of the human imagination. There is always something that one cannot provide for. The genius of an unwritten Constitution has been, I think, in its complete flexibility. I am not convinced that any words that you or I or anyone in Canada could agree on could ever match that flexibility.

Mr Winninger: Thank you for your views.

Mr Beer: I wonder if you might just go into a little bit more detail about the views you have expressed on the "notwithstanding" clause. That has been the source of a lot of discussion and debate, and I think the point that you made is one that certainly the present Premier made in a debate in our own Legislature. Do you have some thoughts on how you would see handling the "notwithstanding" clause? At the present time I think it is after five years that it has to be re-enacted. Would you leave it the way it is in the charter, or do you have other ways of perhaps dealing with some of the problems where people see it as being simply a political tool?

Mr Aimers: Mr Toffoli will address that.

Mr Toffoli: I think at one point the five-year period was put in, which I think reflects what the "notwithstanding" clause was intended to do—that is, to provide immediate relief if a judicial decision might be technically correct, or at least the interpretation of the law which results in perhaps an absurd or a socially damaging decision. For instance, the Supreme Court of the United States in the 19th century ruled that blacks were not people, and similarly in our country, at one time the Supreme Court ruled that women were not persons in law. So judicial decisions can be as bad as what they were intended to correct.

The five-year period was put in to represent the period of the life of a Parliament or a legislature, so within five years there has to be a general election at either the provincial level or the federal. Therefore, a new Parliament is now sitting to decide whether to continue with this decision. It was also to provide time for a constitutional amendment to be put through, and we know how long that can take, and perhaps unsuccessfully. So that was the purpose of the five-year period, and I think therefore the five year is a sensible arrangement for why it was chosen, not because of length of a Parliament.

We have suggested, though, that to get around the appearance, and perhaps the reality, of a government's arbitrarily exercising the "notwithstanding" clause simply to impose a view on which the courts have given good reason why it should not go through, the judicial standing committees on justice of legislatures and Parliament should review decisions by the Supreme Court that overturn legislation. That is, if there is a piece of legislation and the Supreme Court says that it is unconstitutional or violates the charter, if it was automatically referred to the standing

committees of the particular legislature that passed it, then there would be hearings and the arguments could be put forward why this law may be technically incorrect but it is socially valid; or if it is not socially valid, then that would come out and it would put the decision by the government whether to use a "notwithstanding" clause on the basis of a more rational perhaps and public decision-making process. That is one suggestion we make.

Mr Offer: I will be short. Just in passing on the "notwithstanding" clause, I always thought that the underlying principle was the question of who was, in the end result, to have paramountcy, that being the courts or the Legislature. But that we could talk about for days.

Mr Toffoli: You are correct in your view of the Legislature, but the legislatures can do that collectively through an amendment to the Constitution. This is to provide the transition, but the Legislature still had the final say up until that point, yes.

1600

Mr Offer: That was not my question, Mr Chair. It was just a passing comment. You spoke earlier about the most successful political institutions being those that can adapt to change, and I am wondering, if that be your position, then what would follow necessarily is that you would not be opposed to a rejigging of responsibilities provincially and federally as long as the framework for the institution remained intact.

Mr Aimers: That is correct, sir, absolutely. That is the genius of monarchy to us.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr Aimers: Thank you.

TOM CHRISTOFF

The Chair: Could I call next Tom Christoff.

Mr Christoff: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman and all committee members. My name is Tom Christoff and I am appearing here today as a concerned citizen of Canada. My thanks to the committee for giving me this opportunity.

The people of Canada are now being told that our country is not working and that we need a new Canada. My belief is that if this country is not working, it is only the opinions of powerful and influential groups in this country that have brought us to this sorry state of affairs. No one can deny that the events of the past few years by our federal government have not borne this out. The crisis created with Quebec is only another one in its hidden agenda.

When I decided to participate in this discussion about Canada, many, many thoughts passed through my mind as to what I considered was wrong with my country. All the discussions I have heard in the past year have centred on the Constitution and how it does not seem to provide for the people. What people? Is it the ordinary man who is concerned about his rights and place in the country? No, it is not. The Constitution already provides him with those rights or the means to achieve them, as in the matter of our aboriginal people. My educated guess is that it is the people who did not get what they wanted in the patriation of our Constitution; namely, a veto over any constitutional

change, entrenched rights of the French language exclusively in Quebec and a special status requirement to be able to opt out of any federal initiative with compensation whenever it wishes to do so.

Your discussion paper, which I have just received this past Monday, presents to anyone wishing to participate in this discussion a lot of questions to be answered. Your timetable would certainly not permit this. I would like to think, and hope, that this provincial government would look at these discussions as only the first step towards many more in the near future to allow more people the chance to speak out for Canada. We do not need the urgency as dictated by Quebec's ultimatum or even by our own federal government. I will explain this last statement requiring no urgency, simply by briefly describing Canada's constitutional history to date.

Constitutional wrangling has occurred for the past 300 years in Canada, beginning with the royal proclamation in 1763. After the Seven Years' war ended with the Treaty of Paris, British rule was proclaimed for the whole northern Atlantic seaboard, excluding the islands of Saint Pierre and Miquelon. The royal proclamation extended English laws and institutions to Quebec. It was not until 1949 that the French language was introduced as a language of debate in the Canadian legislature. English was still recognized as the official language of the country.

An interesting quotation made by the then governor general, Lord Durham, in 1938 as his assessment of the French situation was "two nations warring in the bosom of a single state." It reflected the relationship between two cultural and linguistic communities in Lower Canada. Upper Canada being predominately English. Can anyone here see a similarity at present? This also resulted in armed rebellion by groups called Parti patriots in 1837. Because they were poorly organized, the revolt was put down quickly and the separatist option was then quiet for a long time.

In 1867, the British North America Act was passed which provided us with our Constitution and recognized the use of the English and French languages in debates in Parliament and in the Legislative Assembly of Quebec. It also applied to all records in both houses. Further wrangling between the nationalists' attitudes in Quebec continued throughout even the 20th century, beginning with the conscription crisis in 1917. A form of bilingual and bicultural country was now being put forth, versus a nationalist view of an independent traditional French Canadian nation. The 1960s saw the creation of the Royal Commission on Biculturalism and Bilingualism. A variety of proposals were forwarded for the restructuring, renewing and even dismantling of the Canadian federal system. Many Quebec nationalists were even advocating a special status for Quebec and even an associate-state status.

This followed with the passing of the Official Languages Act in 1969. It declared English and French as Canada's official languages and extended a lot of government services in both languages to all citizens. Quebec followed this with the passing of Bill 22, recognizing French as the official language in Quebec and restricting enrolment in English schools. It apparently was not restrictive enough

so it followed it with the passing of Bill 101, known as the charter of the French language. This made French the only official language in Quebec and enforced enrolment in French schools for all immigrants.

The 1980s saw the referendum crisis in Quebec and the patriation of the Constitution in 1982. This new Constitution Act brings the British North America Act home from Britain and included a Charter of Rights and Freedoms and procedures to make our own amendments now in Canada. The British Parliament on 18 April 1982 renounced its legislative role in Canada. Quebec disagreed with the amending formula, indicating it was not consulted and did not sign the Constitution Act. In reality, Quebec was outmanoeuvred in its politicking.

Prior to the passing of the Constitution Act of 1982, the Supreme Court handed its decision, meaning "constitutional convention plus constitutional law equals the total Constitution of the country." This decision, of course, led to the Constitution Act being approved without requiring Quebec's consent. Quebec then quickly passed its Bill 62 on 5 April 1982. This bill exempted Quebec from sections 2 and 7-15 of the Charter of Rights. These sections apply to the individual's mobility and equality rights in Canada. They also submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada their right of veto over any constitutional changes. It lost its right for veto with the ruling in December 1982 and it finally rescinded Bill 62 on 17 April 1987.

It is interesting to note that this bill was only rescinded some 13 days prior to the Meech Lake constitutional meeting on 30 April 1987. I might also add that Quebec, while not admitting to being part of the Constitution of Canada, invoked the "notwithstanding" clause in December 1988 in response to the Supreme Court's ruling on its Bill 101. We all should know what followed: the Meech Lake accord, which systematically began to tear this country apart, another crisis situation in Canada, which has been happening for the past hundreds of years.

We are now left with another mess created by the present federal government. With the Meech Lake failure, Quebec's nationalist views were again formed, saying that Quebec is once again rejected by Canada. We all know who persisted with this view during the three years Meech Lake was supposedly debated on; as much of a debate, I might say, as is presently allowed in the federal government, or Parliament. The Prime Minister would not allow a single word to be added or changed. He said that rejecting the accord meant rejecting Quebec. Do you blame the Quebec nationalists for taking up his viewpoint? There is an old saying here that I will repeat that has some significance. It is, "If you say something often enough and long enough, people will begin to believe it as true."

So all of a sudden now the future of Canada is at stake. It is divided and requires change. The Prime Minister proposes a new Canada. What does he mean? He says he will consult the people. Forming committees and commissions will allow ordinary people to present their views on Canada. After all their views are known, Parliament will analyse them and propose a renewed Canada. This is from a Prime Minister who has spent more money than any other

government on polls, only to disapprove of their findings in most cases.

What is Ontario's role in this crisis? I would say it should be similar to the role of all the other provinces; that is, to consider a Canada where all its citizens enjoy the same individual rights no matter where in Canada they reside. The Charter of Rights on equality already provides for this. It only has to be enforced by all the provinces. The free movement of goods and services should be allowed between provinces but should also include the movement of labour. This will certainly take a strong central government and leader to be able to settle the differences that do exist between the provinces. This is one section of the charter that should be strengthened to allow more freedom and mobility. Too bad we did not enter a free trade agreement between ourselves before opening up all our borders to the United States. Together with equality and mobility rights, shared government programs like medicare, social services, unemployment insurance all round out the values, I believe, in what is a Canadian. Increasing duplicity costs between the federal and provincial governments in these matters leave us in the mess we are now presently in.

The roles of the federal and the provincial governments should be redefined so that there is a logical downward responsibility to the provinces. A strong federal government should provide the basic standards required for that particular responsibility, with the provinces administering that responsibility to the standards that are set so that they will apply in all the provinces of Canada.

There is no doubt in my mind that since 1867 some of the powers of the federal and provincial governments will have to be remodelled. Its form, however, should be as outlined in 1867; that is, powers affecting citizens in all the provinces be retained by the federal government so as to provide standardization across the country. For example, two powers I consider should be standardized would be in education and in environment. Provincial or regional powers should not conflict with federal powers and vice versa.

I have very briefly discussed a few of your points and I would be remiss if I did not have something to say about bilingualism. Since it became law in 1969, all government services were opened up to a bilingual person. In some provinces this was seen as an imposition, and with good reason. With only 25% of Canada's population being French, there will definitely be areas in Canada where services in both languages are not required. I do not believe Trudeau expected bilingualism to work instantly but looked at it happening gradually over a period of time. The added costs to some municipalities will also result in bilingualism taking a much longer time to occur unless more federal funds are being made available.

1610

The problem with bilingualism starts with Quebec's language laws. There, bilingualism is not wanted. Their requirement for availability of government services in both languages only exists where 50% is not French. Ontario's law states that services be available in both languages where numbers indicate, and this percentage is 5%. This does not appear to me to be equality in figures. It is also the feeling of some people that bilingualism conflicts with

multiculturalism, the fear being assimilation. A Canada with two official languages, as provided for in our Constitution, will work, given the time. We do not have to react with the present thinking of some; we just have to be patient for a longer time, when the present younger generation will decide this issue for us.

My greatest concern of this committee and all the other government committees is of reacting to Quebec's demands with suggestions for Canada's survival falling on deaf ears again, our man at the top once again rolling the dice and further dividing this country of ours. We are supposed to be living in a democracy. A federal government with a majority relying on its power to rule from members' advocating more power for themselves does not make a government for all of the people and by all of the people.

The Chair: Mr Christoff, if you could sum up, we are beyond the time.

Mr Christoff: I am at the last paragraph.

There is now talk by the federal government and other parties of utilizing referenda for implementing constitutional changes. If we do go in this direction, there is one section I would like to add to our Constitution. It will read, "Ability to govern: A referendum to govern be required whenever 50% of the country's population, as declared by petitions to Parliament, states the present government is unable to govern and must seek re-election." This may seem unwieldy, but we have nothing presently to get rid of a majority government that does not listen to the people. A partisan government does not speak for the people that elects it. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. We will move on to the next speaker, but let me just say, Mr Christoff, because you made this point a couple of times at least in your presentation, that as a committee we understand the need for much more discussion to happen and to try to provide that opportunity to the citizens of the province. Although we recognize the urgency of the situation before us, we also do recognize that reality as well and we will be looking for ways to ensure that that happens.

Mr Christoff: Thank you.

GEORGE SORGER

The Chair: Could I call next George Sorger.

Mr Sorger: First of all, thank you very much for allowing me to speak here. I am not speaking as an expert, just as a concerned citizen.

There are two constitutional changes that I am suggesting that are, in my mind, very important, and our last speaker, I am glad, made reference to them.

The first is that we need a mechanism to get rid of prime ministers who get out of hand. The fact that we have a majority government and that we say we can elect another government is not enough, because between elections a majority government like this one can act in a very despotic manner. So I think it is imperative, and in my whole experience here in Canada I have never felt it more than now, that we have to have a mechanism to get rid of prime ministers who get out of line.

The second recommendation I would like to make is that we need some constitutional mechanism to find out what people feel on major issues. Once again a majority government, which acts because it has a majority, can be despotic, can go ahead and do things that most people did not anticipate when they elected it. This government, for example, was elected on a mandate that had nothing to do with the war in the Gulf, yet they dragged us into the war in the Gulf, on a mandate that had nothing to do with the Oka crisis, which could have been prevented, yet they dragged us into the Oka crisis.

This is a government that botched completely Meech Lake, which has got very severe consequences for Canada, and did not consult with the public on any of these things. So we need I think a way for the public to be heard, and not to have a government that is formally democratic and in fact not. Those are the two constitutional changes I would like to see.

There is something in addition to this, a view I have of Canada. I am not quite sure, since I am not a lawyer, how you would go about implementing ways to see that it would be carried out. The Prime Minister's view of Canada is something that is approximating more and more the United States and I feel that Canada has completely different values from the United States.

I feel that in this country we value fairness, that we value the trustworthiness of authority and the rule of law, that we value teamwork, and that we also value our reputation in the world as a peacemaker. The United States has a very different view of the world and of itself. It views itself as a country of free competition where winning is very important, where it is admissible to have extremely rich winners and poor people who fall through the cracks. They view themselves as a country with a manifest destiny to tell the world exactly what to do and how, and that this is best for it.

I think we should have constitutional guarantees that no government takes us outside of what most Canadians feel Canada should be. If we are going to become more and more like the United States, then this is not something that should be done behind closed doors by a few people making trade agreements and other agreements, or by the Prime Minister agreeing to courses of action that pull us into, essentially, a whirlpool.

I think we need to have a way of guaranteeing what makes us Canadian. In that vein I think that if we are to be attractive not only to Quebec but to other regions of Canada we have to get rid of something that is endemic in our system and that is that we are very top heavy, that there is a large concentration of economic power in the hands of a few individuals in this country, and that provinces and areas of the country feel marginalized because these powerful individuals tend to be localized in certain areas.

I think that, for example, the voice of the Inuit in this country should be worth much more than a contract with some North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally. I think that the voice of the Mohawk nation should be indisputably more important than somebody's project for a golf course. I think we should be preserving our environment, our education, our ethnic mix, our multicultural nature and the

should take priority, including our social services for those people who are disadvantaged.

This should take priority over what is called economic growth because growth *per se* means nothing. Growth has to be ordered and has to be distributed to everybody if it is going to be any good. We are not concerned with that. Our government is not concerned with that, at least it does not seem to be. It seems to be willing to penalize the poor and the working people and to make the rich richer. Sure, that is growth, but it is not the kind of growth that I think most Canadians want.

1620

In essence then, I believe our economic plan should have the aim of empowering as many Canadians as possible to control their destiny through collective bargaining and reason. This means to make a concerted effort to avoid too much concentration of power in the hands of a few and certainly in the hands of non-nationals, and that is a criticism of all our governments, not just this one.

We need to plan an economy that is sustainable; that is, that it does not do irreparable damage to the environment or use up all of a finite resource unless that resource can be replaced with something at least as good. We need an economy where our culture and values are able to flourish, a fair and caring economy, one where the difference between rich and poor is not allowed to be explosive, and where everyone belongs and is cared for when things go wrong.

We need to develop relations of mutual respect with other nations so that they can trade with us with confidence and trust. These relations are the only stable ones. For example, what we are doing in Iraq is definitely completely contrary to that. This means not joining in exploitive ventures or aggression or supporting regimes that are well known for their contempt for human rights, which is something that we do.

If this sounds Utopian, we should look at some of the successful economies, Japan and Sweden, where both stressed giving all their citizens a stake in the economy, not just a few rich ones. In foreign relations, the experience of China, Norman Bethune and the dividends that gave us, I think, should have taught us that good will has very long lasting rewards.

If we had a society like that, I do not think we would have a problem with keeping Quebec in it, and I do not think we would have a problem with the west or anywhere else, because everybody would want to belong because they felt empowered in the society. What has been happening, especially since Mulroney came to power, is that many of us feel less and less empowered, more and more bitter and more and more angry, especially since the war.

Mr Bisson: You will have to pardon my voice. I am just getting over a cold and having difficulty.

You said something that I think strikes a chord. I know that for myself, sitting and listening to the deliberations and presentations of a number of people, we are really in a unique position. We are able to hear things and different points of view, different ideas. You said something that I think can be understated. If I understood you correctly,

what you are saying is that you as a Canadian feel as if what makes Canada whole and what makes Canada what it is today is somehow being attacked on the economic front and on the social front, that we are basically losing the autonomy of our own economy, that we are losing the autonomy of our social policies, etc. Are you saying that you think what is possibly happening today within some of the problems we are having vis-à-vis our Constitution, some of the ill feelings towards Quebec is somehow a reaction to that?

Mr Solger: Yes, I believe not only the feelings towards Quebec, but more so the feelings of Quebec towards central Canada and the feelings of the west towards central Canada and the feelings of the Atlantic provinces towards central Canada, that central Canada is concerned with a few rich people getting a lot richer—

Mr Bisson: Okay.

Mr Solger: —and that that is at the expense of the average guy all over Canada.

Mr Bisson: You also said something that a lot of other people have been saying, and I am trying to come to terms with it. The question is the question of referendum. I understand what is being said, because what you are saying is right. I think people are feeling frustrated and feel as if they have lost some sense of empowerment—

Mr Solger: Yes.

Mr Bisson: —that we have normally had in our society, to be able to every now and then give our politicians good heck and get them to listen to us in order to carry out the will of the people. People are now searching for a mechanism to make that work.

Correct me if I am wrong and give me some direction. The fear I have is that the referendum route, although it sounds very enticing, I have a little bit of difficulty with because I look at what happened in the United States just last fall. There were the elections, where a number of referendums were held across the United States on the question of the environment. I do not think anybody will disagree that in this day and age in the 1990s, the environment supposedly is a number one issue to all North Americans, not just Canadians, but all North Americans generally and probably most people in the world.

As far as I know—I may be a little bit out, but I think it is a fairly good assumption—every referendum that was put forward in order to try to put together direction to give the state legislatures power to be able to deal with trying to clean up our environment was lost, because those who have the money, unfortunately, were those who are polluting and they managed to put enough information out there that people were scared at what the consequences of legislation would be, and therefore not the right thing happened.

Is there not a danger with referendums, that that is what could happen in the end, that he or she who has the most money and the best-organized campaign will win the referendum, even though it is not for the good of the majority?

Mr Sorger: Okay. Actually, I did not think I would get into this, but I believe that what you have touched on is a very important point. It is true not only on referendums on the environment; it is true on any issue that is contentious,

for example, right now, the war. We are getting a whole lot of smokescreen and propaganda and nonsense, and we are not getting the truth, and that is because there is not democratization of information.

I believe that before a referendum occurs, it is not enough for somebody to do what the Mulroney government did, for example, put out a page in all of the papers giving the "version" of reality or for talking heads to give us the version of reality. We should have a way of ensuring that popular views, as well as the views of the powerful, are expressed. The government should make it its business to ensure that these views come out and are published in a way that is accessible to the people so that when the referendum comes, after looking at that, after looking at more than one view—the government has to protect the minority views in this sense—then the public will be in a position to make a decision.

I would go even further. I would like to see a complete democratization of the media as a whole. Right now the media are in the hands of the government and the élites, and I think that that is not correct, that is not good. We need to have a way of expressing public views, dissenting views, in such a way that everybody can see them. Since that is an economic difficulty at the present time, I think the government should make sure that occurs before major decisions—

Mr Bisson: So it is equal access to information—

The Chair: Sorry; we are going to have to stop there.

UNITED DISABLED CONSUMERS

The Chair: Could I call next Ruth Selby from the United Disabled Consumers.

Ms Selby: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I have been watching these proceedings on TV, and not wishing to take anything away from the native people and French language rights, it would seem to me that there are other forgotten peoples in Canada. I am speaking of women, the disabled and the working poor, to name but three. These people must not be ignored, as we are significant in number. I shall confine my remarks to the disabled, as this topic alone is really too broad an issue to cover adequately.

It is hard to know where to begin to try to cover all the unmet needs of disabled persons. For example, transportation, housing, attendant care, attendant care in the workplace, employment, education, income maintenance, recreation, leisure activities, sports, medical services, life with meaning and dignity and quality of life.

How do we achieve justice for persons with disabilities? Service agencies need to be responsible to the disabled, to the very people they serve. Agencies and services need to be restructured and reorganized. They need to be held responsible to the people they serve. Persons with disabilities need to have more responsibility in self-government to make the decisions where the money comes from and where it is spent. We need real responsibility and power, not just to be consulted on a volunteer basis. We need self-determination. It is time to outgrow the protectionist policies of the past.

We have the technology available, especially computer and medical, as well as bioengineering technology, to enable the disabled to have access to an independent lifestyle with dignity, equal access to jobs, information and education in many fields, but it takes people of vision to put it to productive use in our society.

1630

Disabled persons are persons of value who are able and want to contribute to Canada. We must be allowed the freedom and independence needed to integrate and fulfil our lives before Canada can begin to secure our rightful place in an international economy. We need a simplified model. What we have now is too complex and it allows too many people to slip through the cracks.

Legislated poverty: Raise social assistance rates to at least the poverty line. The Ontario government sets both the minimum wage and social assistance rates. The province has failed to take the nationally set poverty lines into account when they have established these income programs. Many people receive amounts that are less than one half of the poverty line. Basic justice demands that this end immediately. I do not mind being poor so much, but if you doubled my social assistance cheque I would still be below the poverty line. Now that is being poor.

On my 25th birthday my grandmother jokingly remarked, "Only 40 years to go and you will get the old age pension." Being young, I was not impressed with her sense of humour. After all, what difference would it make if I exchanged my family benefits cheque with the old age pension cheque, I thought. I would not be any richer. Little did I know, but if I were to turn 65 today I would be entitled to several hundred dollars more a month than I currently receive on family benefits, the guaranteed annual income system for the disabled. I do not want to wait another 20-plus more years to receive this. I need it now.

I think it is the federal government's rightful place to set standards like the poverty line, but what good is it if the provinces ignore it? Is the federal government doing this just for the sake of making noise? Perhaps they should pack more punch, more power. There is no point in going through the motions unless there is some authority to force the provinces to follow these guidelines. We must carefully balance the power between the federal and provincial levels. On the one hand, we have the wealth and power and on the other hand, autonomy and responsibility to the people served.

Yes, there have been many advances, concessions made to the needs of disabled persons, but compared to other peoples we are a forgotten people. We have virtually been left out, especially of the 20th century. We need to self-govern the services and agencies that are set up to help us.

No one really knows our needs and abilities like we do. We have been disfranchised. We have the right to self-government. Disabled persons do not have power or control over their own lives. Disabled persons have finally been recognized as having rights, but that has not done all that much toward relieving the problems.

There is much legislation on individual issues covering much of what is needed by the disabled community, but

we now need to mould it into a whole unit that will cover all the needs of all the people. I believe that can best be done by disabled persons themselves as they can best understand the failures of the present system and what can be done to improve the situation and prevent people from falling through the cracks.

We want freedom to make choices about our lives and work. All that divides us is an accident or serious illness and it could be any of us. We are the same people. We are concerned about jobs, income security and quality services. In the new global economy we can no longer afford to ignore such a large number of persons willing to work who need the opportunity, education and jobs to help Canada move into the 21st century.

I just want to make a few comments on changes I have seen over the years in people's attitudes. When I was a child, a teenager, if I was out on the street or somewhere in public people would stare at me. They would grab their kids and yank them out of the way because they thought they might catch something from me. I do not see too much difference today, although they now think I am going to run the kids down with my electric wheelchair so they yank them out of the way and run, hide and stare, pat me on the head and make a sickly sweet smile and, you know, just do not treat me like a real person.

However, today, the last few years, I have seen a difference in the children and teenagers. They do not stare at me and ask what is the matter with me. They come up and they talk to me. They ask me what my name is, where I live, what do I do, and the teenagers just talk to me like an ordinary person. I see this as a major improvement and I think it is very important.

The reason for this, I believe, is that there has been some integration in the public schools, the high schools. The disabled children have been going to school with the regular kids so they have been meeting on a day-to-day basis, learning about each others' lives. They are not strangers any more and so they accept us as people now, whereas the older people, the adults, still do not.

We need to be in the community, living, working, playing with our neighbours, with real people, where they can get to know us as real people. This way they will find out I am a real person just like they are. The only difference between me and them is I sit down a lot.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Selby. There is time for a few questions and there are a couple of people wishing to ask questions. Ms Churley, you can lead.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much for your presentation. I think I would like to say, first of all, that it is disabled people like yourself and other hardworking people who have advanced the cause of your rights and I think that you should take some credit for that. I do not believe that you would have the rights you have now and the kinds of advancements that you are talking about were it not for people like yourselves fighting for those rights and making people see that you are ordinary, normal people.

Having said that, as you know, during Meech there were three sets of people—aboriginal people, women and disabled—who were on the other side of the barricades, so

to speak, in Ottawa in the final days, feeling left out and ignored. I am just wondering if you are feeling some of the same thing. While people get together and talk about amending formulas and throw all these words out, do you think in fact there is a fear that once again real people, ordinary people, people who have particular needs, are going to be left out once again and, if so, what do you think we should do about it?

Ms Selby: I think hearings like this are very important. I guess I was disappointed in watching the events on television that I did not see very many disabled groups or people represented here. It seemed that everybody was giving everybody else a speech, just a repetition of basically two speeches, two subjects. I watched, hoping to find some other people discussing not more important issues, just other equally important issues. I think as we are going to have Canada emerge as a 20th-century country, we are going to have to recognize all people as being of value. Just consulting with us, having us to input when decisions are being made or before they are made, I think is critical.

Ms Churley: You did see a lot of deaf people, though. I think that having Gary sitting with us at the table is helping that community, so I think the next step is to get other disabled people elected to parliaments as well.

Mr Arnott: You mentioned earlier in your brief about transportation problems for disabled people. I know we have made efforts in the past, and often they have been misguided efforts, to enhance transportation networks for disabled people, and transportation issues are very, very important for disabled people if they are to be integrated into the community. Could you describe how some of our transportation things could be expanded to meet your needs better?

1640

Ms Selby: Well, I came here today on DARTS, the Disabled and Aged Regional Transit System, although, by the time I found out when and where I was to come, I called DARTS and they told me that they could not take me, that they were all filled up for today. I went over their heads to somebody else and managed to get a ride, but it was just a last-minute thing. I have learned how to manipulate the system, but a lot of people have not. They do not know and they just live with it. There is a shortage of rides. There is also a lack of flexibility. You have to plan your life at least a week ahead of time.

My friends do not understand that. They say, "Come on, let's go to a show," or something. I cannot. I need a week's notice. They say: "How can you live like that? I could never plan my life like that. I just go when I feel like it." Everything, even a doctor's appointment, you are supposed to get sick a week ahead of time so you can plan your visit to the doctor, which is a little bit difficult. You cannot go out of town unless you are rich. If you charter a bus to go somewhere, it is around \$300, \$200 a trip both ways, so you do want to be on the wealthy side for that. There are these new Granada coach buses. It only runs from I think it is London or Kitchener to Buffalo and several stops in between. It is very nice, but most of the

people I know say: "I would rather it went to Toronto. That is where I want to go and there is no way to get there."

We are very, very limited in what we can do. I cannot even go to Brampton, which is my home, to visit my friends, because it is so complicated. I just do not have the energy most of the time and enough time in advance to arrange co-ordinating from one service to another, arranging dropoff and pickup times and making sure they pick me up and take me on and not leave me sitting at the dropoff point. It just makes our lives so complex that we do not do anywhere near as much as we could.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Selby.

L'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : I invite next Patricia Picknell de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario.

Mme Picknell : Merci, Monsieur le Président. L'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario est heureuse de vous voir ici dans notre ville de l'acier. M^e Ryan Paquette, qui m'accompagne, saura nous représenter, nous les quelque 9 000 francophones de la région de Hamilton-Wentworth et nous endossons ses propos.

Cependant, je suis ici car je ne peux pas laisser passer sous silence une anomalie, je dirais même une injustice. Le mandat du comité spécial est clair et je cite : «Que soit créé un comité spécial sur l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, chargé de procéder à un examen et de présenter un rapport sur les questions suivantes : les aspirations et les intérêts sociaux et économiques de tous les résidents de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération ; la forme de Confédération qui est la plus apte à satisfaire les aspirations sociales et économiques des résidents de l'Ontario».

Vous nous avez lancé une invitation à parler d'un nouveau Canada, et me voici. Les gens se rendent en grand nombre sur place pour les audiences. Plusieurs autres suivent les discussions à la télé. Je suis une de ceux-là mais après quelques heures il est facile de constater que la place publique semble réservée aux citoyens de langue anglaise. Nous, les citoyens francophones de cette province, nous les Franco-Ontariens qui avons choisi de vivre en Ontario, nous les francophones hors Québec, nous le peuple qui risque d'être le plus pénalisé dans tout ce débat n'avons même pas l'occasion de suivre nos interventions en direct dans notre langue, le français.

Le réseau parlementaire de l'Ontario, ONT.PARL, nous force à écouter une traduction souvent boiteuse lorsque nos propres chefs de file s'adressent à vous en français. Vous nous offrez la possibilité de visionner en reprise les audiences en français au risque de couper mon sommeil car les audiences sont présentées à minuit à la chaîne française. Si je veux m'asseoir devant mon téléviseur à minuit, à une heure du matin, deux heures, trois, quatre heures—je pourrais me voir cette nuit à la télé.

Monsieur le Président, à titre de citoyenne à part entière je vous pose la question suivante : lorsque nous discutons de la Confédération canadienne qui reconnaît nos droits linguistiques, sommes-nous vraiment servis dans la même mesure que nos compatriotes de langue anglaise ? Laissez-nous au moins écouter à des heures raisonnables

nos chefs de file et nos concitoyens de langue française dans notre langue. S'il vous plaît, cessez la traduction, laissez passer la voix des francophones. Merci.

M. Paquette : J'aimerais tout d'abord vous féliciter, ainsi que les membres de votre comité, d'avoir accepté la lourde responsabilité d'étudier le rôle de l'Ontario dans la Confédération. Je veux également vous souhaiter un bon séjour dans notre ville de Hamilton. Aujourd'hui je me présente à titre personnel, en tant qu'avocat franco-ontarien, qui pratique le droit à Hamilton depuis plus de 30 ans et dont les origines ancestrales au Canada retournent à 1651, dont les cinq dernières générations en Ontario.

En suivant vos séances à la télévision, j'ai reconnu de la part de certains des intervenants des propos tellement de bigots, tellement racistes, tellement ignorants de notre histoire canadienne que j'ai décidé de me présenter devant vous pour éclaircir la situation. Le fait est que la quasi-totalité de nos concitoyens anglophones ne partage pas ces opinions mesquines. Bien au contraire, en Ontario, malgré l'impression que pourraient laisser ces quelques racistes et bigots, un Franco-Ontarien peut très bien vivre en français tout en étant respecté de ses concitoyens anglophones. La Loi 8 répond aujourd'hui à la quasi-totalité de nos besoins et il ne reste qu'un pas à franchir pour que notre province soit déclarée officiellement bilingue. Je vous exhorterais à considérer d'en faire la demande dans vos recommandations.

Pour ce qui est de la séparation du Québec, personnellement et malgré le déluge d'opinions au contraire, j'en doute sincèrement. Rappelons-nous le dernier référendum. Le peuple québécois est à mon avis fondamentalement canadien. Le compte final des votes du prochain référendum, s'il y en a un, sera certainement plus serré que lors du dernier référendum mais encore, à mon avis le peuple québécois choisira un Canada renouvelé. Et pour ceux qui veulent absolument voir disparaître le bilinguisme au Canada, laissez-moi vous dire que le bilinguisme ne disparaîtra pas nécessairement, même si le Québec se séparait ; et si le Québec se séparait, combien de temps pensez-vous qu'il faudrait pour que le Québec et l'Ontario s'unissent sous une forme ou l'autre et retournent à la situation d'avant 1867 ?

1650

Il est tout à fait dommage que ce comité spécial sur la place de l'Ontario dans la Confédération soit né d'une crise, ou du moins pour prévenir une crise. L'échec du Lac Meech, la disparité régionale et sociale, la crise d'Oka, le traitement réservé aux autochtones, l'aliénation de l'Ouest, le mouvement souverainiste au Québec, ces crises doivent-elles nécessairement remettre en question l'existence même du Canada ? Sommes-nous vraiment dans une crise existentialiste, ou sommes-nous tout simplement fourvoyés en oubliant notre histoire, nos origines et nos traditions et en subissant les conséquences normales d'un tel oubli ?

Il existe dans l'histoire du Canada des faits historiques indéniables. Premièrement, deux peuples sont venus partager l'espace social au Canada avec les peuples autochtones, l'un d'expression française et l'autre d'expression anglaise. Ces deux peuples sont les peuples fondateurs avec

les autochtones, et ces groupes constituent trois communautés nationales qui jouissent de l'égalité du statut de leurs langues.

Deuxièmement, le Québec dans les faits a toujours été et demeure une société distincte. Il faudrait être aveugle ou n'avoir jamais visité le Québec pour ne pas le voir, et pourtant plusieurs en nient le fait.

Un autre point historique : le multiculturalisme. Au Canada toutes les cultures sont égales. Aucune culture prédomine. C'est un fait que dans l'évolution de notre pays nous avons choisi d'en faire un endroit où il fait mieux vivre, et cela non seulement pour ceux qui y sont nés mais aussi pour ceux qui ont choisi d'y élire domicile en adoptant, avec un bilinguisme officiel, une politique multiculturelle. Le Canada veut faire opposition à l'américanisation progressive par une mosaïque multiculturelle. Le Canada veut prévenir le «melting pot» où tous se sont amalgamés. Il faut cependant bien comprendre l'évolution. Le bilinguisme au Canada doit servir de pierre angulaire au multiculturalisme. Il ne faudrait pas que majoritairement les néo-Canadiens de récente et mame de longue date refusent tout simplement la dualité linguistique au Canada. Ils refusent surtout la réalité française de cette dualité. Le Canada peut être bilingue, mais son bilinguisme sera fait de l'anglais et de leur langue à eux. Ce n'est pas là le bilinguisme officiel du Canada.

Une dernière réalité historique : les autochtones furent les premiers habitants du pays et conséquemment ils sont chez eux au Canada. La communauté franco-ontarienne à laquelle j'appartiens partage et endosse les aspirations de ses frères autochtones. Elle accepte le principe de leur autodétermination, tant du point de vue gouvernemental qu'éducationnel. Cette autodétermination ne devrait en aucune façon modifier l'unité nationale. Les communautés autochtones constituent des sociétés distinctes et devraient avoir d'un degré d'autonomie leur permettant de gérer leur présent et déterminer leur avenir.

Monsieur le Président, il ne faudrait jamais oublier ces faits historiques et permettre à chacun de les interpréter à sa façon. Mes remarques peuvent vous paraître simplistes, mais pensez-y et évitons la confusion ; enseignons et proclamons clairement l'histoire et les structures de notre pays. Il ne faut pas accommoder notre histoire ou l'interprétation de nos lois pour plaire à un groupe ou à un autre. Dans une société multiculturelle, la tentation de le faire est grande.

J'accepte et j'admets qu'une nation évolue. L'histoire, elle, ne change jamais. La Loi constitutionnelle de notre pays proclame l'égalité juridique de la langue française et la langue anglaise au niveau fédéral et le droit à l'instruction dans la langue de la minorité est enchâssé dans la constitution canadienne. L'histoire du Canada n'a pas commencé en 1991. La plus grande garantie de l'unité et de la cohésion du Canada, c'est d'assurer la sauvegarde et le développement des droits linguistiques sur tout son territoire.

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité spécial, je vous remercie de votre attention et vous souhaite bonne chance et bon courage dans la rédaction de votre rapport final.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Paquette et Madame Picknell. Vous avez soulevé la question de la traduction et je voulais simplement dire que nous sommes conscients de ce problème. Il y a les deux aspects. Il y a d'un côté le fait que la retransmission du réseau parlementaire se fait dans les deux langues, en français et en anglais ; il y a les deux transmissions. La situation est que par la suite c'est aux compagnies de câble de décider laquelle des deux elles vont retransmettre.

Évidemment, dans la plupart des régions de la province, particulièrement dans le sud de la province elles se décident pour la version anglaise. Quant à la chaîne française, ce n'est pas à nous de lui dire quand elle doit ou peut, oui ou non, retransmettre nos réunions. Nous savons qu'il y a là un problème. Je ne sais pas si on peut trouver des solutions immédiates mais on va essayer.

Mme Picknell : Vu que lundi prochain vous vous trouverez à Ottawa et que sûrement plusieurs de nos chefs de file seront à Ottawa, possiblement il y aura des personnes que nous allons reconnaître. Certainement il y a des personnes que nous voulons écouter. Est-ce qu'il ne serait pas possible, pour la dernière semaine, de laisser tomber la traduction pour que nous, francophones, puissions suivre ce que nos francophones ont à dire ? Est-ce que c'est trop à demander à la majorité anglophone qui quand même peut écouter la journée longue ?

M. le Président : Je comprends votre position, madame, et il y a évidemment d'autres situations qu'on doit aussi prendre en considération, mais on va se pencher là-dessus. On va voir si on peut trouver une solution.

Mme Picknell : Merci.

M. le Président : M. Beer avait une question pour vous.

M. Beer : Une chose qui serait aussi à souligner avec ce comité spécial est que c'est la première fois qu'on a un comité roulant, avec la télévision et tout ça. Sans doute à la fin de nos séances il y aura beaucoup de choses que nous allons proposer pour peut-être améliorer ce qu'on fait, mais je pense qu'on comprend très bien ce que vous venez de dire et nous devons trouver une solution.

Je sais que vous deux avez travaillé dans ce domaine très longtemps même si vous êtes très jeunes, mais je reconnais surtout le travail que vous avez fait. Si on peut trouver, en effet, une solution à ce problème qui existe actuellement et que le Québec reste à l'intérieur d'un Canada renouvelé ou quoi que ce soit, avec ce qui se passe depuis les dix, peut-être quinze derniers ans, est-ce que vous êtes optimistes pour l'épanouissement du fait français ici en Ontario ? Je pense que très souvent les gens parlent des francophones de notre province comme étant une sorte de bras du Québec, au lieu de voir qu'il y a une communauté de francophones ici en Ontario qui existe depuis le commencement et que cette communauté veut rester en Ontario et au Canada. Quelles sont vos opinions maintenant sur l'avenir du fait français en Ontario ?

M. Paquette : C'est le point que je voulais faire. Je voulais détruire complètement l'opinion ou l'impression qui pourrait être laissée par certains individus qui, étroits d'esprit, on pourrait dire des extrémistes, laissent l'impression

que nous en Ontario souffrons énormément. Nous ne souffrons pas. Nous avons établi la gamme quasi-totale de nos besoins.

La Loi 8, une loi relativement récente, nous aide énormément. Nous sommes établis chez nous. Nous sommes chez nous. Mes parents, mes aïeux y sont depuis plus de 200 ans. Nous sommes chez nous ; nous nous sentons chez nous. Nous n'avons pas de problèmes majeurs. Nous avons travaillé avec une certaine ardeur pour établir et gagner les gains politiques que nous avons gagnés. Mais c'est avec une harmonie, une entente. Il n'existe pas ce grand dilemme, ce grand combat. C'est insultant même de parler de survivance ; on peut parler d'épanouissement si vous voulez. Est-ce que ça répond à votre question ?

M. Beer : Oui, merci.

1700

ASSOCIATION DES ENSEIGNANTES ET DES ENSEIGNANTS FRANCO-ONTARIENS

M. le Président : J'appelle maintenant Rosaire Provencher et Henri Bigras.

M. Provencher : L'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens et la direction de l'école secondaire Georges-P-Vanier remercient la commission Silipo de leur donner l'occasion de répondre au questionnaire du gouvernement sur la place de l'Ontario dans la Confédération. L'AEFO, unité secondaire de Hamilton, regroupe les enseignants et enseignantes qui oeuvrent dans les classes de langue française de l'école secondaire Georges-P-Vanier de Hamilton.

Le Canada est à un moment décisif et déterminant de son histoire. Nous félicitons le gouvernement de l'Ontario d'avoir pris l'initiative de consulter d'une façon démocratique ses citoyens et citoyennes avant de prendre des décisions de grande envergure.

L'avenir d'un Canada tel que nous l'avons connu est en jeu. Nous observons dans ce pays, depuis quelques années, des événements déconcertants sur la scène politique, socioéconomique et culturelle, tant au niveau national qu'au niveau provincial : l'échec du Lac Meech, les disparités régionales et sociales, la crise d'Oka, le traitement réservé aux autochtones, l'aliénation de l'Ouest. Il y a aussi le chômage, la surtaxation de la population, l'augmentation incessante des sans-abris et des banques de nourriture ainsi que le mouvement souverainiste au Québec. Tout ceci remet en question l'existence du Canada.

Mesdames et messieurs les commissaires, en tant qu'enseignants et enseignantes oeuvrant avec les jeunes, nous avons raison de nous inquiéter. Pour cette raison nous aimerions vous faire part des conclusions que nous avons tirées lors de nos discussions avec nos membres, avec nos jeunes et avec d'autres organismes francophones de notre communauté. Nous croyons que l'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle prépondérant dans deux domaines : premièrement, dans le rapprochement des différentes régions du pays. En effet, sa réputation de grande puissance économique et son attraction industrielle font que l'Ontario a moins de revendications fondamentales à formuler et peut ainsi jouer un rôle de médiateur ; deuxièmement, dans le rapprochement des différentes communautés. Avec un demi-million

de francophones, de nombreux groupes multiculturels et de nombreuses communautés autochtones, l'Ontario est bien placé pour signaler l'importance de maintenir des liens étroits et fructueux entre les différents éléments de sa communauté.

Nous aimerions que notre gouvernement joue un rôle de leadership et soit un modèle dans la création d'un Canada plus démocratique : premièrement, en déclarant que les communautés francophone, anglophone et autochtones ont l'égalité de statut en Ontario ; deuxièmement, en déclarant un Ontario bilingue et en faisant la promotion de la dualité linguistique autant dans sa propre province que dans le Canada entier ; troisièmement, en oeuvrant au plan économique à la création d'une économie plus indépendante de notre puissant voisin du sud, en développant une technologie canadienne. Dans ce but, nous suggérons que le gouvernement ontarien investisse davantage dans le domaine de l'éducation, en particulier que le gouvernement redresse les torts faits à nos jeunes francophones par l'absence de collèges communautaires de langue française, en créant des collèges tels que décrits par la firme ACORD.

Nous vous invitons ici à revoir les grandes études sur les problèmes auxquels font face les jeunes francophones tels que présentés dans le rapport Churchill et le rapport de la commission Bourdeau sur les services collégiaux en français dans les centres du sud-ouest de l'Ontario. Nous espérons grandement que leurs recommandations soient mises en oeuvre—notre quatrième recommandation—en créant un conseil scolaire homogène de langue française.

En réponse au document de consultation, Changement et renouveau, je vais laisser M. Bigras faire quelques commentaires.

M. Bigras : Nous les enseignantes et les enseignants croyons que les communautés autochtones constituent des sociétés distinctes et on devrait tout faire aux niveaux économique et politique pour aider les autochtones, surtout la jeunesse parce qu'on oeuvre avec les jeunes. Vis-à-vis du Québec, nous acceptons volontiers que le Québec est une société distincte qui est reconnue et acceptée par le reste du Canada.

Le fait que certains pouvoirs distincts seront à l'avenir rapatriés au Québec ne lèsera pas les droits des citoyens de l'Ontario. Au contraire, nous estimons que l'unité du peuple canadien avec le Québec se solidifierait si on répondait avec sincérité et efficacité aux besoins particuliers perçus et vécus des Québécois. Vis-à-vis du multiculturalisme on dit oui, c'est très important, mais pas juste faire semblant. Pour vraiment que tout le monde ait un emploi, que tout le monde travaille — c'est lorsque ça va mal au niveau économique que le racisme sort, qu'on blâme les groupes ethniques qu'ils soient francophones, Italiens, Juifs etc. Donc, vraiment au niveau économique on vise le plein emploi.

En conclusion, et je pense ici que c'est très important, nous signalons que les Franco-Ontariennes et les Franco-Ontariens, en dépit de tout changement au niveau national, sont ici pour rester et pour s'épanouir. On est des Ontariens ; on va rester ici. Il n'y a personne qui va nous mettre dehors. Notre contribution est et sera toujours historique. Nous souhaitons qu'en retour nos droits soient ancrés et

protégés de façon authentiquement légale et constitutionnelle. À ce moment critique de l'histoire de notre pays, l'Ontario doit jouer un rôle de leadership dans la définition d'un nouveau Canada juste et démocratique. Là-dessus on vous remercie de nous avoir donné la parole.

1710

BARTON SECONDARY SCHOOL

The Chair: We are going to hear next from two groups of students, the first from Barton Secondary School. There is Jim Ruddle, principal of the school, and some students who are here.

Mr Ruddle: Mr Chairman, we have three student speakers, Gillian Sewell, Erica Lowartz and Cung Nguyen.

The Chair: We are going to have to ask you to use one of the microphones.

Mr Nguyen: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Cung, and along with me today are Erica and Gillian. We are here from Barton Secondary School to represent Barton and to express our concern for the future of Canada.

Politically, there is no doubt that federalism should be what Canada is heading towards. However, national unity cannot be repaired by simply trying to appease the nationalists in Quebec. It is true that the political structure of Canada and the distribution of power need to be reformed, but Quebec's demand for transfer of powers from the federal government to the provincial government is not the answer.

If the powers of the federal government are limited, Ottawa will become nothing more than just the central bank of the country and its national borders. If each province held more power than the federal government, it would mean political chaos in Canada because every time Ottawa passed legislation, it would need the approval of all 10 provinces to become law. With 10 different governments, I am sure that there will always be one government or two or even three that are going to disagree and therefore veto the legislation. If this happens with every single legislation, the needs of Canadians will not be addressed and will not be dealt with properly.

With 10 different governments, Canada becomes like a mini-commonwealth. Instead of being one country, we are 10 countries under one small empire. There would be no room for nationhood then. Instead of having a national Olympic team, we will probably have 10 different ones. The CBC would not exist any more because it has been the instrument that has kept Canadians united from sea to sea since it was first instituted.

Canada needs a strong central government to govern and direct Canada. We need a strong central government to lead us into the future. What is more, a strong central government will make our negotiating position at the international level stronger.

Being the world leader of peacekeeping, we have a lot of influence on many other nations, as indicated by our involvement with the United Nations. I think that if we show some compassion and understanding towards one another, our constitutional differences can be solved. As

one country, Canada can overcome any obstacles and any challenges that get in our way, as we have done collectively for 124 years.

Canada has been a refuge for many different cultural groups. As a result, we have become known to the world as a mosaic culture, a country where different groups and different people are encouraged to preserve their way of life. Why are we not preserving this haven then? It is something that we should be proud of as a Canadian identity.

In 1978 my parents had the choice of going to the United States or Canada. Back then I did not know why they chose Canada, but I know now and I am glad they made the right decision. I have been in Canada for two thirds of my life. I am a Canadian citizen and Canada is my homeland. I think I speak for many people when I say that if Quebec leaves, I will feel a personal loss.

Ms Lowartz: We are all Canadians and Canadians have a unique identity, different from all others. Our economy is also unique. We have a small population but an extremely powerful economy. We are second only to Japan in economic growth in the world between 1984 to 1989. We belong to the Group of Seven leading industrialized countries.

During the period of 1984 to 1989, we were the top country in job creation and had the second highest per capita income. Canadian households had an average income of \$50,000 in 1989. Canada is drastically improving. We should ask ourselves: Why ruin Canada now by letting Quebec leave? If Quebec leaves, will we belong to the group of 77, along with Guatemala, rather than being in the Group of Seven?

Personally, I am proud to be a Canadian. Our economy is very well off. Like my two friends here, I was born in Canada, and I have known no other than being Canadian. I would feel very lost if—it would be like losing a part of my background, losing a part of my history.

As Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said last week, "Canadians today are concerned with the economy, but in the end economic prosperity depends on national unity." There is a strong connection between the economy and the Constitution. Canada will work if we adopt economic policies that will cause people to work with one another and give themselves some central goals.

During 1989 Ontario exported \$16 billion of goods to Quebec. The trade between these two provinces supplied 200,000 people with jobs. If Quebec separates, will these 200,000 people, with spouses and children who need to be fed, lose their jobs?

Canada receives a lot of income from tourism. There would be many problems going to Quebec to visit relatives or friends or just for vacation. Some people would not want to go through the hassle of getting a passport, currency changed and border troubles. This will cause Quebec to lose money in travel and tourism. Also, Quebec's neighbours, Ontario and New Brunswick, would lose money in the same field.

Who would pay for use of the St Lawrence River, Quebec or Canada? The St Lawrence Seaway is in Quebec's boundaries but Canada built it. Would either of us want to go through the hassle of paying to use it? We both need

it to import goods from outside our continent. Also, would we have tariffs on goods coming across the border and are we willing to pay them?

Quebec depends on the rest of Canada and Canada depends on the rest of Quebec. Should we be willing to give up Quebec? Should Quebec be willing to give Canada up? These are questions we should examine before we lose something unique, special and valuable.

Ms Sewell: To start, I would like to borrow a few words from a famous 20th-century politician: "Only in winter can you tell which trees are truly green. Only when the winds of adversity blow can you tell whether an individual or a country has courage and steadfastness."

We as Canadians are starting to come upon troubled times. The fact that one of our provinces may separate appals and saddens me. It is only in a time of despair and uncertainty that the true colours of a person or a country are revealed. The cowardly answer to this problem presently facing us would be to say, "Let them go."

I speak from experience when I say it is much easier to work out our differences now than later. I was not born a Canadian. I was born in Belfast, Northern Ireland, and my mother and father chose Canada as a place to live, raise a young family and start a new life. Most natural Canadians do not know how lucky they are to live in a country that protects people's rights, freedoms and cultural differences.

Canada is known to be a cultural mosaic that has pieced together many different cultures and religions into one happy country. Many people choose to come to this great land knowing their differences will be accepted, respected and even protected. I think it is this attitude that makes Canadians especially unique, each of us in our own way, yet each of us Canadian. My own feelings are that I will always have strong ties to Ireland and that I will always be British, but first and foremost I am Canadian. I chose to become a Canadian citizen and am very proud to say so.

What will happen to Canada if Quebec separates? Will attitudes on both sides of a new border harden if there are no incentives to co-exist? Canadians would experience a backlash towards minorities across all of Canada. This would include the English-speaking people in Quebec, the more than one million French-speaking people outside of Quebec, as well as disabled and the aboriginal people.

Because I have experienced this type of cultural trouble before, I speak truly from the heart when I say I do not want Quebec to separate. I am not saying that if they do we will see any of the bloodshed the people of Northern Ireland have, but I do not want to experience the division of a great country or the growing pains associated with a new one.

There may be problems with our country's Constitution and policies, especially on the subject of minority rights, but I hope they can be worked out and Canada can remain Canada, because without Quebec it just would not be the same.

A recent Maclean's poll has shown that most Canadians do not want Quebec to leave but they cannot find a way to tell Quebecers not to do so. It does not need to be complicated. It just needs to be done. To all my fellow Canadians,

I ask you to join together now, because the loss of even one member of our family would be a tragedy.

Uni le Canada prospérera, séparé il s'écroulera.

United, Canada will stand, and only divided will we fall.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation. There are a couple of questions.

1720

Mr Bisson: It is always heartening to know that our younger generation is going to maybe do a better job than we have done, from the deliberations we have heard from young people coming before us. With a little emotion, what you are saying is—let me preface it this way: there is a certain amount of fixation vis-à-vis some of the problems we are having in our country regarding the Constitution and everything in relation to Quebec, and we need to recognize that there are other parts in Canada that also have problems and want to address certain questions. The western provinces are also saying they want to have certain provisions within the Constitution that would protect their rights as westerners, and have an equal voice. We talk about a triple E Senate. There is a number of issues that need to be addressed.

First of all, part of the problem is that we tend to fixate on the bad things happening right now, to the point where we are building resistance, that nobody is going to want to talk to each other if we keep going in this direction; recognizing there are some problems, yes, there are people who have pretty strong views on both sides, but if we keep the rhetoric going, maybe we are not going to be able to solve those problems.

The second thing is that when you spoke initially—I did not catch your name, the gentleman on the left.

Mr Nguyen: Cung.

Mr Bisson: Tim?

Mr Nguyen: Cung.

Mr Bisson: I worked underground for many years, so I can hardly hear it.

The other thing is that you said we cannot be in a position of giving any provinces special powers. The reality is that there are provinces out there asking for exactly that to happen. Not only Quebec—other people are saying we need to have provisions within our Constitution that redefine some of the existing powers we have now and make them clearer so provinces could better control the regionalism and the reality of regionalism in each area. The question I am asking is: How far do we go? Recognizing you need to have a strong central government, but on the other hand you need to have a government that is closer to the people with regard to regional differences, to be able to deal adequately with the problems, how far do we go?

Mr Nguyen: In 1864, the Fathers of Confederation gathered in Charlottetown to discuss a unified Canada. Back then, there were three different regions of Canada: Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes. We were having a political stalemate because nobody, no government or no party, could get enough of a majority to govern the country and every time one party wanted to pass legislation the others disagreed, and we had to go through the elections. I

it did not work before, I do not know why it would work again.

In answer to your question of how far we would go to providing regional representation, I think one of the answers is that the Senate should be an elected body and it should be representative regionally, evenly.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you so much for coming. You really have brought a very different perspective. I do not think we have had quite the mix, and certainly we want as many young people as possible.

I am wondering—a very short question, first—have you used the discussion paper we have at Barton? Did you use it at all?

Interjection: I do not know.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I hope you will take a look at it. I think you will find it interesting, and I certainly feel it has a lot of meat in it that you could deal with.

You have spoken with a great deal of compassion yourselves, certainly with understanding. You have asked the real questions. I have not heard yet a practicality. I am wondering if you could say something about what either you think you could do to engender more compassion and understanding or what you think this committee could do, or a little of both.

Mr Nguyen: I am not exactly sure, but I have the view that our crisis is being caused right now by everybody saying each group has a certain right. Why do those people not ask: What about Canada's right? What about Canada as a nation? Forget that each group has to be recognized as distinct or special. Why do they not just put their feelings aside, or that one view they have, and unite together under the same flag and try to save Canada?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Would the girls have a comment?

Ms Lowartz: I believe there should be total equality, that there should be no division of any minorities. Personally, I want to go into the police force, and right now I know they are only letting in certain minorities because they say there are too many white males in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I believe anything like that should not be allowed. A person should be judged on their ability; not their outsides, but really their insides.

Ms Sewell: As far as the cultural groups and the groups that are "special" are concerned, I think most people realize they are special. It is an issue that needs to be addressed. Quebec, I think, is just bringing forth the issue in front of everyone else, but I think they speak for a lot of groups when they come forward and say, "We want these rights." I think they do deserve them.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for your insights.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation.

ÉCOLE SECONDAIRE GEORGES-P-VANIER

M. le Président : The second group of students is from l'école secondaire Georges-P-Vanier. Je voudrais inviter Annie Lefebvre, Patrick Perron et Phillippe Kotacka à nous adresser la parole.

M. Kotacka : Bonjour. Je m'appelle Philippe Kotacka. Je représente la minorité allophone et ceux qui ne sont pas

d'origine française ou québécoise de mon école secondaire Georges-P-Vanier.

Je voudrais en premier remercier ce comité de me donner l'occasion de leur adresser la parole. Je sais que je parle pour beaucoup d'autres lorsque je dis que ce genre de forum est un exemple de la démocratie en pleine vigueur. En gros, je suis ici pour partager avec vous une simple expérience personnelle qui enfin pourrait peut-être servir d'exemple pour bien d'autres.

I have been raised in neither a French nor English household, but a Czech one. My parents, who do not speak French, decided to immerse me in the French education system and culture. Today, I am very thankful of their decision.

I began my school experience in a French immersion program. I had not always been so fond of being different, and this was very hard for me. These feelings stem from various factors which involved how I was treated. At times, certain people resented me for the reasons that I went to a different school as well as not being able to speak proper English. Sometimes, I wished I could be just like everyone else and forget about French altogether. Yet, with perseverance and the realization that others were in the same situation as I, I was sure some good would come of it.

Depuis mon entrée dans une école totalement française, mes vues personnelles ont changé. J'ai aperçu que la situation et l'atmosphère étaient totalement différentes. Maintenant, j'ai rencontré un nouveau problème : celui d'être accepté par les francophones. Je voulais tellement maîtriser la langue française pour faire partie de leur grande famille, mais encore, il m'ont perçu comme un étranger. Avec le temps et la tolérance des deux côtés, on s'est mutuellement acceptés.

Now attending Georges-P-Vanier secondary school, I find all these problems rarely recur. My fellow students, who are mostly of francophone origin, have totally accepted me, as well as me accepting them. We have learned to laugh together at the subtle differences of our unique cultures. We have learned to work together to help each other, if necessary. We always try to set aside our ideological differences and our cultural barriers in order to maintain good relations and an almost family-like atmosphere.

J'ai appris aujourd'hui que si les francophones ont pu m'accepter, m'adopter totalement dans leur famille scolaire avec grande tolérance de mon français anglicisé, nous pouvons apprendre à tolérer d'autres cultures. De mon expérience personnelle, j'ai la conviction que les gens de notre pays peuvent vivre en harmonie. Merci.

Mlle Lefebvre : Permettez-moi de me présenter, je m'appelle Annie Lefebvre. Je suis étudiante à l'école secondaire Georges-P-Vanier et je représente le cycle sénior. Je suis présentement en onzième année.

J'aimerais pour débiter remercier le gouvernement néo-démocrate et la commission Silipo de m'avoir donné la chance d'être ici parmi vous aujourd'hui, et aussi d'avoir pris en considération la voix et l'opinion des gens de cette province et surtout d'avoir reconnu les minorités linguistiques dont le français. Ceci est une preuve de la démocratie en marche en Ontario.

En plus, je voudrais souligner le but de ma présence aujourd'hui. Je ne suis pas venue ici pour faire la morale ni pour débiter des statistiques innombrables, mais seulement pour parler de tout mon cœur au sujet du futur de ma province, et de mon pays qui pour tant d'années a veillé sur mon bien-être et ma sûreté.

Étant francophone originaire du Québec, je n'ai pas eu vraiment de complications en ce qui était de ma carrière scolaire, et je pouvais m'exprimer dans ma langue maternelle, qui était le français, à l'école Notre Dame aussi bien qu'en anglais lorsqu'il s'agissait de sortir de la maison. J'ai cru que m'exprimer en français aurait été plus facile lorsque la Loi 8 fut mise en vigueur, donnant aux francophones les services en français dont ils avaient besoin. Mais hélas, cette Loi n'obligeait pas toutes les villes de devenir bilingues ou même d'appliquer cette Loi dans leur municipalité.

Donc, à ce moment, certaines villes du Nord se sont déclarées unilingues anglophones, ce qui rendait l'idéal de tout francophone encore moins accessible. Pourtant, le Canada a été fondé par deux langues et l'assimilation des francophones fut imminente autant en 1800 qu'aujourd'hui. Nous voulons seulement nous faire une place dans ce pays car nous la méritons. Nos ancêtres normands se sont forcés et ont travaillé autant que les Anglais pour se bâtir une vie et se bâtir un pays dont ils seraient fiers. Si seulement nous pouvions nous unir pour parler d'une seule voix constituée de deux ou plusieurs langues, nous pourrions accomplir tellement de merveilleuses choses. Car, comme le proverbe le dit, c'est en nombre qu'on peut acquérir le pouvoir dont nous avons tous besoin pour faire honneur à notre réputation d'être un pays où la paix et l'honneur règnent.

Nous vivons dans un pays où règne la démocratie et où vivent les gens les plus extraordinaires du monde. Le fait qu'un grand nombre de personnes peuvent s'exprimer en deux langues ou plus est un avantage. Je ne veux forcer personne de parler ma langue mais nous devrions être fiers que les francophones hors Québec peuvent garder une place ici et vivre en harmonie avec le reste des citoyens.

I would like to thank the government here, and I would like to live and grow within an environment that recognizes that I am a French-speaking citizen and that I, as well as any other citizen, have unalterable rights. As I have stated before, the right to express in my mother tongue is unalterable. Bilingualism and multiculturalism should go hand in hand. After all, we are in a country which has been greatly appreciated and renowned for its recognition of different citizens coming from varying backgrounds.

M. Perron : Bonjour. Laissez-moi me présenter, je m'appelle Patrick Perron. Je suis un Franco-Ontarien. Je suis ici aujourd'hui pour représenter ma classe de français au niveau du cours préuniversitaire de l'Ontario. Nous aimerions remercier le gouvernement de l'Ontario et tous ceux qui ont fait un effort pour rendre ces paroles possibles.

Laissez-moi vous décrire ce qu'est un Franco-Ontarien. Un Franco-Ontarien est un citoyen de l'Ontario dont la langue maternelle est le français. Dans notre région, c'est-à-dire dans le sud de l'Ontario, un Franco-Ontarien parle aussi l'anglais mais dans le nord et l'est, dans les régions

d'Ottawa et Sudbury, il est possible qu'il parle seulement le français. C'est donc pourquoi je vais faire ce discours en français et en anglais.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me introduce myself. My name is Patrick Perron. I am a Franco-Ontarian. I am here today to represent my French class of the OAC level. We would like to thank the Ontario government and all the people who made the effort to make this forum possible. Before I begin, I would like to outline what a Franco-Ontarian is. A Franco-Ontarian is a citizen of Ontario whose mother tongue is French. In the southern peninsula, a Franco-Ontarian will also speak English. In the north and in the east, a Franco-Ontarian may also speak French.

La francophonie est en danger. Les Franco-Ontariens représentent seulement 5% de la population ontarienne. La Loi 8 qui fut introduite par David Peterson en 1986 permettant aux francophones d'avoir les mêmes droits provinciaux que les anglophones, malheureusement cette Loi n'oblige pas les communautés d'adopter le bilinguisme. À la fin de l'année 1989 et au début de l'année 1990, plusieurs villes ontariennes se proclamèrent anglaises seulement. Au mois de décembre de l'année passée le poste de télévision de Radio-Canada fut éliminé à Toronto. À cause de cette décision, nous ne pouvons plus maintenant regarder les nouvelles de la région, nous sommes obligés de regarder celles d'Ottawa. À cause des défauts dans la Loi 8 et des coupures de la Société Radio-Canada, nous sommes entraînés à perdre nos liens d'information avec la culture française. Nous sommes en train de nous faire assimilés. We are being assimilated.

Anglophone, francophone, c'est quoi la différence ? Nous sommes tous des Canadiens ; il est illogique pour notre pays de se battre. Nous avons déjà ouvert nos portes à des millions d'immigrants. Notre pays est bâti sur le multiculturalisme. Si tous les gens de notre beau pays parlaient les deux langues, il n'y aurait pas de tensions et les problèmes seraient vite oubliés. L'année prochaine le Québec propose de se séparer du Canada. Nous comme Franco-Ontariens devons nous poser les questions suivantes : que va-t-il nous arriver après la séparation du Québec ? Est-ce que le français au Canada va devenir une minorité pas une langue officielle ? Nous ne voulons pas que le Québec se sépare, nous voulons rester un pays, pas deux. Nous voulons garder nos droits. Nous n'avions pas les demandes du Québec pour rester dans le pays. Le Québec est déjà une société distincte, un simple coup d'oeil vous le dira. Si les demandes du Québec sont exécutées, toutes les autres provinces vont ensuite les exiger à leur tour.

Our economy is in danger. There are many things we can change that will improve Canadian standards. We would like to know why there are not enough jobs. Instead of paying people welfare, why do we not give them an education? After all, it is a lack of organization in the system that brought them there. We must break down the trade barriers in between the provinces. We must invest in our own technologies instead of our neighbour's technologies.

We also feel that bilingualism should play a bigger part in the job market. It would bring harmony between the two groups. Due to the free trade agreement between the United States and Canada we are losing more and more

jobs. Companies move to the United States or merge with larger American companies. Now Mexico is in a separate free trade deal with the US. What will happen to us as Canadians?

Nous ne devons pas oublier les autochtones. Ce n'est pas les Français ni les Anglais qui ont fondé ce pays, c'est les autochtones. L'affaire de Confédération les a poussés dans de petites réserves, leur a enlevé leurs droits et leur culture, leur mode de vie. Nous croyons que les autochtones devraient avoir leur propre gouvernement. Ils ne sont pas des enfants. Ce n'est pas juste qu'ils soient obligés de s'assimiler. Après tout, c'est leur terre aussi.

In Ontario our grandparents and our parents had to fight so that we could get French schools. As it stands now, we have two bilingual universities, four bilingual colleges and one French college. In Hamilton there is nothing to satisfy our thirst for knowledge—in French, that is. It recently came to my attention that a French college was to be built in Mississauga, but due to the lack of funding the project was scrapped or put aside. Is that what education means to you?

What we want out of Ontario is simple. We want a just province and a just country. We want rights given to our natives. We want our own French culture and means of communication. We want a green Ontario. We want a province with great economic strength, both worldwide and nationwide. We are the future of this country and these are our rights and this is what we ask of you.

Ce que nous voulons est très simple. Nous voulons un pays égal. Nous voulons un pays juste envers les autochtones et les autres cultures. Nous voulons une culture française et les liens d'information en français. Nous voulons une province qui est forte dans l'économie mondiale et fédérale. Nous voulons une province qui s'occupe de l'environnement. Nous sommes le futur de ce pays et voici ce que nous vous demandons. Merci beaucoup. Thank you very much.

M. le Président : Merci. Are there questions? Une question ? Monsieur Beer.

M. Beer : Merci beaucoup. Vous êtes ici à Hamilton et dans cette région les francophones sont certainement entourés d'anglophones et la culture est vraiment, pour la plupart, de langue anglaise. Je pense qu'une question qui pourrait être intéressante pour tout le monde est : comment voyez-vous l'avenir du fait français dans cette région ? Est-ce que vous avez l'intention de rester ou envisagez-vous d'aller à Ottawa ou à Sudbury pour suivre des cours au niveau postsecondaire ? Quels sont vos points de vue sur l'épanouissement du fait français dans cette région ?

740

M. Perron : Pour l'éducation, j'ai l'intention d'aller à Sudbury, mais pour vivre, après l'université j'ai l'intention de revenir vivre ici. Si le Québec se sépare, comme francophone je pense qu'on n'a pas grand espoir, on est une minorité et ça va être tout.

Mlle Lefebvre : Grâce à l'input des écoles d'immersion, je crois qu'on va rester tout de même une minorité mais il va toujours y avoir quelques petits francophones

qui vont essayer de dire leurs opinions et qui vont essayer de mettre leurs deux cents dans la conversation.

Mr Kotacka : Twelve cents.

M. le Président : Autres questions ? Mrs Witmer.

Mrs Witmer: Thank you very much. I appreciated your presentation. You talked about multiculturalism and bilingualism going hand in hand, I think, in your final statement. How do you see that going hand in hand?

Ms Lefebvre: I come from a different background and any Jewish person who comes here from a different background, and a Czechoslovakian coming from a different background, will bring his different language and try to integrate it within his country. So I think that if bilingualism is instated in the country, other languages will also try to bring up their own businesses, their own industries and we will all be able to grow from that, if we can all learn how to live with different cultures and different languages.

Mrs Witmer: But are you not saying, though, the expectation is that those people would also learn French and English?

Ms Lefebvre: Yes.

Mrs Witmer: So they would actually know three languages.

Ms Lefebvre: Yes. That would be even better.

Mrs Witmer: I think that is an important point. So what you are looking at is bilingualism, plus the third language that they have brought with them to this country.

Ms Lefebvre: Yes. That would be an advantage to us, I think.

Mrs Witmer: Because when you talk about bilingualism, then, you are not talking about their native language and French or their native language and English; you are talking about English and French.

Ms Lefebvre: Basically, yes.

Mrs Witmer: Okay.

Ms Lefebvre: But if other countries come, they will learn from us and in turn we will learn from them, so maybe later on we will become—is that a word, polylingual? More than two.

The Chair: Multilingual.

Ms Lefebvre: Okay, multilingual. I think that we would just be kicking butt. Sorry.

Mr Bisson: There we go—input. I think Five Alive said that. Obviously I never made it as a comedian, so they threw me into politics. And that is questionable at this point.

Okay, to the young man on the left, just to share with you, what you expressed in regard to sort of the transition that you make in, you know, your first language going into a second language, I think I need to say that it is not something unique that you felt. My first language being French, it is also something that I had to go through when I went through learning my second language, which is English.

The question is that what you are basically saying is that you feel as if you have been enriched by it. What can you say to people out there who are so resistant to the whole question of bilingualism, the whole question of

learning a second language? What can you say to them to encourage them or to try to get them to understand?

Mr Kotacka: I think that before people start re-establishing this country politically we should really try to understand one another on a cultural level. I have been able to do it and my friends here have accepted me and they are francophone, so I think it is very possible. It is not always easy, of course. I have mentioned, of course, in the beginning it was not easy and I did not like it, but you kind of have to rough it out, and it works out in the end.

Mr Bisson: No scars in the end? Show you have no scars.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Merci.

ANTHONY BRATSCHITSCH

The Chair: Can I call next Anthony Bratschitsch, and I apologize for the mispronunciation.

Mr Bratschitsch: The dissolution of Canada is not and will not be imminent if we examine our basic values, define each region's needs and establish a national agenda to ensure the survival of our Canadian heritage. In other words, we are now called upon to do the same things that our fathers of Confederation were required to do in the 1860s, and because they did their job well examining values, defining regional needs and establishing a national agenda, Confederation has worked extremely well.

However, it appears today that our heritage is threatened while the federal government vacillates in trying to re-establish its credibility to all the regions of Canada. Therefore, the province of Ontario has a historical obligation today to assume a leadership role in the reinforcing of the understanding of the mutual benefits of Confederation, as it did over 120 years ago when there was no federal government as we know it today.

The threat to Confederation comes from different factions within Quebec and is based on some real concerns and on some misconceptions. To ensure survival, Canadians must address those real concerns, which for the most part pertain to the propagation of the French Canadian identity. It is easy to identify, prove and justify that the French Canadian identity was, is and will be necessary to ensure the survival of Canadian Confederation.

As effectively, we must identify and disprove those misconceptions that are now attempting to tear Confederation apart.

First, Ontario must prepare a message to Quebec and to the other members of Confederation solidifying its views of Quebec's status. As it was at the time of Confederation, Quebec society today is fairly homogeneous, and of course it wants to remain so. Today about 85% of Quebecers are of French origin. They are descendants of an enduring breed of people who first colonized Canada. They explored it, they mapped it, they settled upon it, they made treaties, fought battles and paid their heritage with their courage, sweat and blood. These people established an enduring identity that survived when their ties with France were cut off in 1759, and this enduring identity still prevails throughout all parts of Canada. This identity is an important part of Canada's composition. It is a strength

and not a weakness and it is in Canada's best interests to honour and respect its French Canadian presence.

While many Canadians outside of Quebec believe that the French Canadian culture is such a strong and vibrant society, that in itself assures it of its survival. It is not unreasonable for Quebec to request certain definitions and guarantees to be written into a Constitution. This expectation is not only reasonable, but it is a continuation of the spirit of Confederation, an old promise that is still as important today as it was yesterday.

Ontario's task is to ensure that Quebec understands our sincerity. Only then can we work together to dispel the following dangerous misconceptions. There are many commissions, reports, polls and other forms of sentiments within Quebec that allude towards the dissolution of Confederation. Many Quebec fingers are being pointed towards anti-francophone hotbeds that exist in this nation, but anyone can build a case to prove any point. Assurances are being given that Quebec can survive and even prosper as a sovereign state, but this is not true, for both Quebec and the rest of Canada would suffer dearly.

Perhaps more than anything else, the Allaire report embodies the most dangerous and misleading concepts that threaten our heritage. This report calls for the deconfederation of Canada and it bases its findings on the wrong premises. Ontario must counter the Allaire report with its own statement that examines our basic values, defines regional needs and re-establishes our Canadian heritage. Ontario must disprove the basis of the Allaire report and in view of misleading information, it must show the people of Quebec the real value of the economic folly that would envelop their society should they decide to deconfederate.

The Allaire report represents a sentiment in Quebec that Confederation was originally a partnership between two nations, not an agreement among individual provinces, which is a general conception held outside of Quebec. It espouses a view that Quebecers are vulnerable to a federal government where they are not justifiably represented. The Allaire report dictates a take-it-or-leave-it demand, with deconfederation of Canada as the only alternative.

When the British North America Act was passed in 1867, a league of four colonies was confederated into the Dominion of Canada for political and economic reasons, mainly to define and accept an understanding of goals and differences, to promote east-west trade within those provinces and to counter American influences.

In 1871, it was determined that 92% of Canada's population was directly related to either British or French origins. British Columbia had entered Confederation that year, Manitoba did so the previous year and Prince Edward Island was about to do so two years hence. Meanwhile, the Americans were also well entrenched in their expansion programs, frantically incorporating new states and territories through a dual nature process that eventually led to morbid consequences. In a bid to maintain or improve their influence, the north and the south wrestled with each other to designate the status of each new state as either abolitionist or slave state.

750

On the other hand, Canada had no need and it had no jurisdiction to designate each new province as either anglophone or francophone. Acceptance into Confederation provided each province with more autonomy than any new state would obtain by joining the United States. Our country was established on a principle of mutual acceptance of the British and French cultures and our uprisings of 1831 and the Red River rebellion pale in comparison to the American Civil War and the Indian conflicts.

As Canada grew, it changed. In 1986, our census showed that only 58% of all Canadians were of British or French origin. Yet Quebec's enduring identity remained fairly homogeneous. Our Fathers of Confederation examined and understood the values of the day. They had provided for the heritage that we currently enjoy. The Allaire report does not give credit to our forefathers and certainly does not provide any insight to the future.

Of the 55 Quebec members of the federal government's party caucus, 13 of them are cabinet ministers, filling over one third of the 38 cabinet positions. Another 24 Quebec caucus members carry influential status as chairpersons or vice-chairpersons of powerful committees, or are parliamentary secretaries. It would appear that the federal government has endeavoured to represent Quebec's interests and concerns in our national legislature.

Ontario must inform the people of Quebec of the consequences of deconfederation. Common sense dictates that sovereignty association is not viable. Divorcees do not share the same bank account. Likewise, the remaining provinces of Canada and Quebec would have separate currencies, separate debts and separate credit ratings. While both disaffected parties would suffer, the people of Quebec could probably encounter more of a serious economic setback.

In Quebec consumer debt, business debt and provincial debt total almost \$150 billion, not including the \$90-billion portion of its national debt. At face value, this would make Quebecer the most indebted person in the world. Even worse, deconfederation would leave Quebec only with its own currency, which would probably not have the market value of the present Canadian dollar. As it is, Canada is riding in bad financial shape. Deconfederation would hurt all Canadians and it appears that it would put Quebec, and maybe the rest of Canada, into an abysmal financial condition.

The effects of the Allaire report and other commissions, polls, etc. only serve to further alienate Quebecers from other Canadians and to accelerate the forces that strain the bonds of Confederation.

I can personify this effect into an experience I had as a young schoolchild in a predominantly French Canadian school in Quebec. I had French Canadian friends until one day during wintertime when our principal decided to separate the English-speaking and French-speaking students by building a mountain of snow piled across the middle of the schoolyard.

Instead of achieving his intended objective, the mountain became a symbol of superiority and a lot of fun. After a day's battle in determining "king of the mountain"

between the English and French factions, the mountain was cleared away. However, even as a young child, I implicitly understood that the line was drawn.

The Allaire report's misconceptions on one hand and anti-French hostilities on the other hand only serve to build mountains of misunderstandings between Quebecers and other Canadians. Constitutional amendments have been proposed before, i.e. the 1979 Pepin-Robarts Task Force on Canadian Unity, Pierre Trudeau's proposed amending formula and even the Meech Lake accord. But while a specific, suitable solution is required, it is difficult to find one without a meaningful dialogue, and especially at the other end of the Allaire report's take-it-or-leave-it shotgun approach.

Therefore, it falls upon Ontario to assume leadership during this crisis on behalf of all Canadians. As at the time of Confederation, Ontario must once again demonstrate the willingness and spirit to co-operate with and to respect French Canada's enduring identity. Some people have made sure that the lines are drawn. Now it is up to some of us to rise to the challenge and to overcome these threats to our heritage.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We will move on. We have a number of additional speakers. I think we will probably be able to take one more speaker, and then we will break at that point. What we can do is to ask the remaining people on the list who have asked to speak if they are able to come back at an evening session. We will do our best to add them to that list.

SAM SHORE

The Chair: I call next Sam Shore.

Mr Shore: Gracias, Mr Chairman. The only reason I wanted to come here today is I feel that there is nobody here speaking for the English people of the province. I was quite disturbed the other night when I saw the program coming from I believe it was Sudbury. There was a gentleman there who had been a tailgunner on a bomber during the war and he said he could no longer get a service in English in his town. That disturbed me very much.

Mr Bisson is shaking his head now. Have you checked into it to see if that is true or not?

Mr Bisson: Sir, I live in that area. It is quite the contrary—

Mr Shore: How about the young fellow who is—

The Chair: Sir, make your presentation, please.

Mr Shore: Thank you very much. There was another young fellow who wanted to get a job cutting grass in North Bay and he said that the grass did not speak French or English and he could not get the job because he did not speak French.

Anyway, I am Sam Shore. I was born and raised near Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, the oldest of about 10 children. My people came from Ireland in 1820 and my grandfather built the Rideau Canal. It has become one of the worst places in Canada, as far as westerners are concerned, because all the ills of Canada they believe come from Ottawa.

I left home at the age of 16 and got very little education. We did not have the opportunities out there. I have ridden the freight trains across Canada and many a time I

knocked on the door in the province of Quebec for a meal when I was down and out and I was never turned away in Quebec. I did not know that Quebecers were any different from anyone else in Canada.

I joined the army during the war. I served five years plus in the army, four and a half of it overseas. We had French Canadians with us and they were my friends and they were just as good men as any we had in the army. Unfortunately, only 2.25% of the army overseas were French Canadians. I understand now that in the Department of Veteran Affairs, and I stand to be corrected on this, 40% of the people working there are French Canadians.

Be that as it may, I get a disability pension and last year, I believe it was, the government took \$350 house-keeping money from all disability veterans. I am fortunate. I manage my money much better than the government managed my money and I do not really need it, but there are others who do. At the same time as they voted for this, and they said this money was taken off us to pay down the debt, the parliamentarians voted themselves \$6,000, to my knowledge, tax-free, and this hurts a lot.

I hear a lot of people talking about Quebec separation and worrying about the business we do with Quebec. Well, I would say 50% of the business done with Quebec is between governments, and Lord knows they will find a way to do business no matter what happens. The other business—Quebeckers are not stupid. They are some of the most astute businessmen in the world and they will find a way to make a living and they have more people within, closer than Thunder Bay. If you would look at a map, it goes right down to the state of Kentucky and they have got all those people to deal with. That is why they wanted free trade, and I wish them well.

1800

If you take a map of Canada and wheel it right down the west coast, you will find it where it reaches all the way down to Chile and Peru, and the cheapest mode of transport is water. Conversely, from the Newfoundland side it reaches right down to Argentina, and the cheapest mode of transport is water. So do not worry about Quebec as far as trade is concerned. We do not have free trade among provinces right now.

I understand it costs \$7 billion a year for French immersion. I am not against French, but I think it should be user-pay for these schools. There is no English immersion. I have travelled around the world. I was in Spain and Portugal in December, and they stopped teaching French in the schools there five years ago. English is the second language. Anybody in Quebec or the world generally who cannot speak English is a deprived person. Anybody in Quebec who cannot speak English is a doubly deprived person. I would like them to learn to speak English. Of course if we are all bilingual, we only need one language anyway.

Another thing is the difference between a million and a billion. If I gave one of you \$1,000 a day for three years, that is approximately \$1 million. Did anybody ever stop to think of how long it takes to give a billion dollars out at \$1,000 a day? Three thousand years, and that is the difference between a million and a billion. Most people do not

even think of it. Governments throw a billion around like it is chickenfeed, and I worked too hard in my life to take that from my government.

The other thing is flags and bigots. There are some members of this committee I do not recognize. I wish you had your political affiliations on there. It would make it easier for me. They came across to many people I have spoken to as a group of bigots, and I said, "Well, I am going to go and ask why nobody ever protects anything of the English." Nobody ever says a word. You never did question it. I do not expect you to question me because you do not agree with what I am saying. You only question—and your questions are usually longer than what the people who spoke said—and you never get to what you were going to say in the first place, which I am having trouble doing right now.

But the flags. I heard you, Mrs O'Neill, the other day about the flags over in Quebec, and you saw a Canadian flag there. They are on federal buildings. I believe a picture of one of my great-uncles hangs in the archives that moved over there. He unfortunately fought in the Riel rebellion, which I am not too proud of, because our Indian people, but that is another story.

Interjection.

Mr Shore: Yes, okay, Mr Bisson, you are the comedian. The only thing that really brought me out was the fact that nobody seemed to be speaking for any English people. I know you people have taken a lot of abuse and I do not like to see it. I would like to think you are on our side everybody's side.

The other thing is Bill 8. Bill 8 threw the Liberals out and put the NDP in. Believe me, if you do not water this thing down, you are going to have highway signs in Ontario in French and English. But believe me, if you go to France, the stop signs there say "Stop." The only place in the world is Quebec. If you think it is going to make the roads or highways safer to have French on there as well go to Quebec. They do not have anything but French on there. Is it that dangerous to drive in Quebec? I do not know.

Anyway, I thank you all for listening to me. I have said my piece.

[Remarks in Spanish]

The Chair: Thank you. I think there are—

Mr Shore: Any questions?

The Chair: Yes, there are a couple of questions. Very briefly, Mr Bisson.

Mr Shore: Good.

Mr Bisson: Mr Shore, I understand your frustration quite honestly and I sympathize. I am not mad and I hold no malice. The only thing is that you made the comment a little while ago that nobody has an opportunity to ask questions. Understand where I am coming from also, as francophone. I am a little bit raw to this issue, because I have people sitting here sometimes who speak on the issue and obviously I have some emotions on it. Some of the things that have been said and you repeated, I have difficul-

with. You talked about the Second World War as if francophones made no contribution to the war.

Mr Shore: Oh, they did.

Mr Bisson: Well, we should admit—

Mr Shore: They made 2.25%.

Mr Bisson: There was more than 2.3%, but the point is that all of my family, my father, my uncles, all served in the war, and some were decorated. I served in the armed forces myself so I really—

Mr Shore: They were the best there was.

Mr Bisson: But I do not want to get into personal things. I understand what you are saying. The difficulty is that somewhere within the building of this nation, we understood from the beginning that we were going to follow a certain premise. That premise was going to be that we were going to recognize that there was two cultures that came here at one time and started to build a nation. Somewhere we forgot the native people and now we have got to straighten out that mess.

What I have a hard time understanding is, and this is the question I am asking you, "Why is it that there is such a hard time from some people within the anglophone community and francophone community, quite honestly, to try to come to grips with what the history of this country is all about?" I am a francophone. I have no difficulty understanding where you are coming from and I feel quite comfortable within the anglophone majority society here. I fervently believe that most anglophones have a lot of respect and are quite understanding. But some people really have a hard time with it. Tell me what it is and why it is so difficult to accept.

Mr Shore: Mr Bisson, I was raised out west and I was fortunate. We were very far from schools and we were very far from churches, so my mind has not been cluttered with education or religion, which I am thankful for. But that does not mean I have not learned. I will tell you out here I did not hear one person all my life ever run down a Frenchman, a Norwegian or anybody else. Our local reeve was a Mr Deschambeau and one of the finest you would ever meet.

It was not until this Trudeau era came along that this has started, and the English-speaking peoples feel the pressure going on all the time. Signs and cornflakes, as they say, do not bother me at all. It is just the fact that I think the Anglo-Saxon community feels under pressure, and I am only speaking as an individual, always remember that. But I grew up with no malice. We had Ukrainians. My father used to say: "Don't you ever laugh at them. You don't have to speak English to be intelligent. When they grow up, they will speak your language and their own and they will be twice as smart as you are."

Mr Bisson: But the thing is that I, as a francophone, also feel those same pressures that you do.

Mr Shore: I believe you do. As a matter of fact—

Mr Bisson: The thing is that there is a lot in common between us.

Mr Shore: I agree. As a matter of fact, my best man lives in St. Boniface, Marcel Pelletier, and it was not until

after the war I said, "Marcel, how come you did not get to be an officer in the army?" I said, "You had the educational qualification." He said, "Well, I was French in an English outfit," and he joined from an outfit from Toronto. Consequently, he felt it, and it was not until then that I felt that he had been discriminated against and he was not given his just dues. But I believe in the English community there is not the feeling against the French that there used to be in my age group.

Mr Bisson: Oh, I agree.

The Chair: Mr Shore, you made a comment towards the end, saying, "Why can't we all be on everybody's side?" and I think that is what we are trying to do, quite frankly. I think that we realize that there are some very deep feelings, some very strong perceptions among our English Canadians about some of the language issues.

There are equally strong feelings among the Franco-Ontarians and among people of all language backgrounds, and I think that hopefully in part what we can do is to begin to face some of those perceptions and those realities and bring them out and deal with them, try to deal with the anger that is there and try to see if in fact there is a way in which we can at least coexist with each other but hopefully even go beyond that and really be able to interact with each other and accept the strengths that we have to offer to each other with all of our varied backgrounds.

Mr Shore: I was fortunate during the war to be in Italy for a couple of years and I learned to speak a bit of Italian. I do not know if you speak the language or not.

The Chair: I do.

Mr Shore: And I say that no matter how many languages you learn, none of them does you any harm, but you must have English in this world.

The Chair: But surely that is something that we all agree with, sir.

Mr Shore: My wife and I were in Sydney, Australia, and we had to bail out French Canadians who could not speak English. It hurt my being to think that they, on this continent, were deprived people. They did not speak English. Get some English immersion in. Thank you all very, very much for your time.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. We will end the session then at that point. We will come back as close to 7 as we can, please, folks, so we can resume. Thank you.

DANICA DJUKIC

Ms Djukic: I have something to say. I think basically—

The Chair: I am sorry, madam. We are—

Ms Djukic: I think that basically everything that has been said here is what once John F. Kennedy said.

The Chair: Just a second. What is your name, madam?

Ms Djukic: My name is Danica Djukic and I was a grade 12 graduate and am ready to be a college student. I feel that the one thing that is most important to us is what once John F. Kennedy said: It is not what our country can do for us, but what we as citizens can do for our country.

Everything that was said here today about multiculturalism I believe.

To give you an example of racism and prejudice that I have encountered in my lifetime, I was working—I highly want to become a teacher's assistant or a teacher eventually, either a child youth worker or a teacher—for a Catholic school board in a nursery school. I will not name the school. I will just leave it out.

But what I am trying to say is that because of my background, being Yugoslavian—I have British in me, my mother tongue is anglophone—but I have grown up in a Serbian setting because my father is Serbian. Because of that I have noticed—I do not know if you guys are aware of it—that everything that has happened to you guys, the

French and the anglophones being at war with each other, is the same as with us, the Croats and Serbians. I think that this is ludicrous. We all have to join in together as one.

Whether it be anglophones or francophones, we each have to identify and reshape our values so as to meet and become one. Whether we are anglophones or not, like they said, in one country we need signs or something. Like the gentleman said here, when he went to France, there were only French signs. I think that we need to settle our differences, set aside our prejudices and think together.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We will recess at this point.

The committee recessed at 1814.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1919.

The Chair: Perhaps I can call the meeting to order, please. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, and on behalf of the committee I would like to welcome those people who are here with us this evening and those people who are following our proceedings over the parliamentary channel. We are in Hamilton at McMaster University, and this is the last day of hearings for us this week in the third week of a four-week schedule that has us at different places across the province hearing the views of the people of Ontario—individuals and organizations—on the future of Canada and the Canadian Confederation.

I would like to just take a minute to introduce the members of the committee. This is a committee which is made up of the three political parties that are represented at Queen's Park. From the NDP caucus in addition to myself we have Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee, Marilyn Churley, Ellen MacKinnon and David Winninger; from the Liberal caucus, we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer, and from the Conservative caucus we have Ted Arnott and Elizabeth Witmer.

We heard this afternoon from a number of speakers here in Hamilton. We have an equally long list this evening. We will have to do as we did earlier today, which is to ask those people who are presenting on the original printed list to try to keep their comments, please, down to below 10 minutes if you are presenting as an individual and to certainly within 20 minutes if you are an organization. That will allow us the opportunity to add some of the other people who want to also speak to us and do the best that we can to accommodate as many people as we can. We are prepared this evening, as we have been on other occasions, to extend the time, and we will do our best to accommodate everyone.

CONSEIL DES DIRECTEURS ET DES DIRECTRICES DES ÉCOLES FRANCO-ONTARIENNES DU CENTRE-SUD DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: Perhaps we can proceed then by calling the first presenter, Renée Lapointe du Conseil des directeurs et des directrices des écoles franco-ontariennes du Centre-sud de l'Ontario.

Mme Lapointe : Bonsoir, je m'appelle Renée Lapointe et je suis directrice d'écoles élémentaires pour le Conseil des écoles séparées de Hamilton-Wentworth. J'aimerais également vous présenter mon collègue Pierre Boutin, qui est directeur de programmes pour le Conseil des écoles séparées de Dufferin et Peel.

Au nom du Conseil, je tiens à remercier très sincèrement le gouvernement de l'Ontario, et plus précisément les membres du comité spécial sur la place de l'Ontario dans la Confédération, pour cette occasion qui nous est donnée de présenter nos idées, nos aspirations et nos recommandations ayant trait à la place et au rôle des Ontariens et des Ontariennes au sein de la collectivité canadienne.

Le Conseil regroupe les directions de 44 écoles élémentaires et de 10 écoles secondaires des régions de Simcoe, Durham, Toronto, Dufferin, Peel, Halton, Wellington, Waterloo, Hamilton, Wentworth, Welland, Niagara, Brant, Haldimand et Norfolk.

Les étudiants et les étudiantes qui se trouvent présentement dans nos écoles sont âgés de 4 à 18 ans. Ils et elles sont incontestablement les fondements de cette réalité croissante qu'est la francophonie du sud de l'Ontario. C'est donc au nom de ces jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes que notre conseil de direction d'écoles fait aujourd'hui cette présentation.

L'avenir du Canada. Nous sommes tous très conscients et conscientes de la situation précaire du Canada d'aujourd'hui. L'échec du Lac Meech, les disparités régionales et sociales, le traitement réservé aux autochtones, l'aliénation de l'Ouest et le mouvement souverainiste du Québec remettent en question l'existence même du Canada.

Le conseil, au nom de qui je fais cette présentation, est d'avis que l'Ontario, en raison de ses forces économiques et industrielles, peut jouer un rôle prépondérant dans le rapprochement des différentes régions du pays. Nous sommes aussi convaincus que l'Ontario possède assurément tous les éléments nécessaires pour concrétiser à l'échelle nationale le rapprochement qui devrait exister entre les différentes communautés. La présence d'un demi-million de francophones, de nombreux groupes multiculturels, des communautés autochtones bien établies fournissent effectivement à l'Ontario les composantes nécessaires pour un projet de société solide fondé sur le respect collectif des différences culturelles et linguistiques qui pourrait servir de modèle au pays tout entier.

Quel devrait être l'avenir du Québec au sein de la Confédération ? Nul ne saurait nier que le Québec, en raison de son histoire et de sa réalité actuelle, est de fait une société distincte. Nous sommes d'avis qu'aucune des provinces canadiennes n'est perdante en reconnaissant au Québec ce statut de société distincte. Ainsi, la reconnaissance officielle du caractère distinct du Québec est conforme à notre conception du Canada et de la Confédération.

Quelle place devrait-on conférer aux autochtones dans la collectivité canadienne ? Le traitement accordé aux autochtones par nous les Canadiens à travers des siècles d'injustices à l'égard de ce peuple fondateur demeure une honte nationale. Même si toutes les mesures correctives ne sauraient effacer cette tache noire de l'histoire du Canada, il est d'importance capitale que les communautés autochtones soient reconnues comme des sociétés distinctes. Le Canada tout entier se doit de mettre en place des mécanismes qui permettront à ces mêmes communautés l'autonomie à laquelle elles ont droit afin de gérer leur présent et de déterminer leur avenir.

Je voudrais maintenant définir de façon plus précise une des composantes de ce projet de société, soit la place des Franco-Ontariens et des Franco-Ontariennes au sein de notre province.

L'histoire nous rappelle constamment la très grande contribution des francophones dans l'établissement des différentes régions de l'Ontario. Nul ne saurait nier l'apport des francophones en tant que peuple fondateur dans les régions de Windsor, de Penetang et du nord de l'Ontario.

Ce statut incontestable des francophones de l'Ontario en tant que peuple fondateur devrait se traduire par un ensemble de politiques et de gestes concrets qui serviraient à redresser les torts qui ont été faits aux Franco-Ontariens et aux Franco-Ontariennes et à leur donner la place qui leur revient au sein de la collectivité ontarienne en leur permettant de s'épanouir pleinement sur tous les plans.

Le plan linguistique. La loi de 1986 sur les services en français, plus communément connue comme la Loi 8, donne aux francophones dans les régions désignées le droit à des services dans leur langue. Cette loi demeure inadéquate puisqu'elle ne répond que partiellement aux besoins des francophones et crée par le fait même deux classes de francophones : ceux et celles qui ont droit aux services d'une part, et ceux et celles qui n'y ont pas droit d'autre part. Il est aussi très évident que trop souvent cette Loi ne se traduit pas toujours par des gestes concrets dans le quotidien. Voici un exemple qui touche plus précisément au mandat même de ce comité spécial : alors que tous les Ontariens sont invités à soumettre leurs opinions et leurs recommandations face à l'avenir de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, le poste de télédiffusion parlementaire, ONT.PARL, plutôt que de diffuser les présentations dans la langue dans laquelle elles sont présentées, présente une traduction anglaise de toutes les présentations qui ne sont pas faites en anglais. C'est donc dire que la voix des francophones se voit bloquée et qu'on leur nie le droit de participer aux audiences du comité en tant que téléspectateurs. Ce geste, aussi banal puisse-t-il sembler, amène les francophones à se poser la question, à savoir, le gouvernement de l'Ontario est-il vraiment intéressé à entendre la voix des Franco-Ontariens et des Franco-Ontariennes ?

1930

Il devient de plus en plus évident que la question de la langue ou plutôt de la dualité linguistique doit se régler avant même que l'on pense aux autres composantes de ce projet de société. Comme l'affirmait Gilles Bisson, député de Cochrane-Sud et vice-président de ce même comité, dans une entrevue avec l'Express de Toronto tout récemment : «Ça fait plus de 120 ans que l'on s'obstine sur la question linguistique. Si on veut se développer comme pays, il nous faut mettre cette affaire derrière nous une fois pour toutes et reconnaître que notre pays a été bâti par deux nations, française, anglaise et par les autochtones. Il faut être capable de reconnaître nos différences». Vous avez parfaitement raison, Monsieur Bisson. La reconnaissance officielle des droits linguistiques est incontestablement à la base de la francophonie ontarienne.

Notre Conseil est d'avis que si l'Ontario veut se définir par rapport à l'ensemble du Canada, il est primordial d'accorder au français un statut de langue officielle.

L'éducation. L'éducation, aux paliers élémentaire et secondaire, est sans contredit le domaine où les francophones de l'Ontario ont marqué les plus grands pas. Du Règlement 17 à la Loi 75, tout un monde s'est écoulé.

Nous reconnaissons et nous apprécions la volonté du gouvernement de l'Ontario d'améliorer la qualité de l'éducation à ces mêmes paliers par les démarches en cours visant l'éventuelle création de conseils scolaires homogènes.

Si les francophones sont assez bien desservis en ce qui a trait à l'éducation aux paliers élémentaire et secondaire, il n'en est sûrement pas de même pour ce qui a trait à l'éducation postsecondaire. L'inexistence d'institutions postsecondaires francophones, sauf pour la Cité collégiale, qui a ouvert ses portes tout récemment à Ottawa, oblige les francophones à se rendre dans des institutions anglophones ou soit-disant bilingues ou encore à décrocher. Le taux très élevé d'analphabètes chez les francophones de l'Ontario, et leur niveau inférieur sur le plan socioéconomique, sont des résultats très concrets de cette carence. Il est intéressant de noter que notre province voisine, le Québec, possède depuis plusieurs années déjà un réseau de collèges et d'universités bien établis, soit huit collèges et trois universités, pour répondre aux besoins éducationnels de sa minorité anglophone.

L'accès à l'éducation postsecondaire en français est à la base de la survie et de l'épanouissement des Franco-Ontariens et des Franco-Ontariennes. Le Conseil de l'éducation franco-ontarienne, dans son plan directeur, affirme : «L'étudiant qui arrive au postsecondaire est au stade de l'affirmation de soi. C'est la période privilégiée où il teste les valeurs acquises, se donne une orientation de vie et se choisit un devenir».

L'éducation collégiale et universitaire permettra aux Franco-Ontariens et aux Franco-Ontariennes de développer leur leadership, d'affirmer leur engagement face à leurs valeurs et d'acquiescer la formation qui leur est nécessaire afin d'être concurrentiels sur le marché du travail. Le Conseil de l'éducation franco-ontarienne, dans le rapport précité, affirme de plus : «Pour la minorité, l'école constitue un lieu privilégié et est le seul milieu à accorder une place prépondérante à la langue, élément indispensable à la création de sentiment d'appartenance et d'une identité culturelle. L'école doit être considérée comme faisant partie d'un ensemble intégré à un projet global d'éducation permanente. Même si l'article 23 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1982 ne traite que de l'éducation aux paliers élémentaire et secondaire, la suite logique de l'engagement pris par le gouvernement de l'Ontario est d'offrir cet enseignement au niveau postsecondaire».

Il est donc nécessaire et urgent que le gouvernement de l'Ontario s'engage à mettre sur pied des institutions collégiales et universitaires qui permettront aux Franco-Ontariens et aux Franco-Ontariennes de devenir des citoyens et des citoyennes à part entière.

Services sociaux et communautaires et services de santé. Il est devenu évident que le système d'éducation à lui seul ne peut suffire à combler les besoins des francophones, et que ces derniers se doivent d'être soutenus par un système d'appuis communautaires qui tienne compte de leur réalité.

Afin de pouvoir se réaliser pleinement, les francophones de l'Ontario doivent pouvoir avoir accès à des services sociaux et communautaires et des services de santé dans leur propre communauté. La Loi 8, en théorie, donne à certains francophones dans les régions désignées droit à

es services. Il demeure cependant que dans la pratique, es services ne se réalisent pas toujours de façon concrète. es structures des ministères, Santé et Services sociaux et ommunautaires, sont telles que la prestation de services st remise aux niveaux régional et/ou municipal. Les ges-ionnaires à ces niveaux, de même que les agences de ransfert, ne sont pas toujours convaincus de la nécessité 'offrir des services en français. Ainsi, les francophones ont trop souvent soumis à la volonté ou encore au manque le volonté de ces mêmes instances. Cette réalité place les rancophones dans des situations de revendications conti-nuelles. Il en résulte donc que des groupes de bénévoles loivent dépenser des énergies incroyables à justifier et à égocier la prestation de services qui sont foncièrement les droits acquis.

Le domaine des garderies pour jeunes francophones ait état de l'inégalité flagrante qui existe par rapport à la prestation de services. C'est un fait reconnu que la garderie oue un rôle des plus importants en tant que milieu linguis-que et culturel pour un nombre croissant d'enfants d'âge préscolaire. Pour les francophones, il s'agit de prévenir 'assimilation précoce de ces jeunes et de faciliter leur in-tertion dans le milieu scolaire.

Ainsi donc, notre Conseil estime que le gouvernement le l'Ontario doit élaborer et mettre en oeuvre des modèles le prestations de services qui garantiront aux francophones es services auxquels ils ont droit dans les domaines de la anté et des services sociaux et communautaires.

Répondre aux besoins d'une minorité n'est sûrement pas chose facile. Cependant, nous sommes convaincus que 'Ontario possède les ressources humaines et matérielles nécessaires pour élaborer et concrétiser ce projet de société qui nous permettra le plein épanouissement de tous les itoyens et les citoyennes.

En guise de conclusion, je voudrais tout simplement iter le Conseil de l'éducation franco-ontarienne qui, dans 'énoncé suivant, exprime très bien ce qui à notre avis se loivent d'être les fondements de notre nouveau Canada que tous tentons de définir :

«Le milieu dans lequel se développe tout être humain est le reflet d'une civilisation donnée dans laquelle l'acquis natériel, moral et spirituel d'un milieu historique léterminé est accepté et vécu par une collectivité. Celle-ci e compose d'individus dynamiques qui, durant toute une rie, se façonnent, par choix, évolution et mutation, des nouvelles attitudes face à cet acquis. La somme de ces tititudes constitue alors une culture dynamique, teintée des equis de la civilisation qui la forme et façonnée à l'image les individus qui la composent».

Les Ontariens et les Ontariennes doivent exprimer claire-ment leur volonté de participer à un tel projet de société.

M. le Président : Merci. Il nous reste du temps pour quelques questions.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am going to make a statement be-fore I ask my question. I would like you to know a little bit about my background. La Cité is in my riding, I did work on Bill 109 for many years and had the great honour of actually introducing it in Ottawa-Carleton as part of my duties as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education.

You did mention, as has been mentioned earlier today, about the translation, that the francophone cannot hear the francophone presentation as it is being given in French. That is a small thorn in your side, maybe bigger than I realize. I do feel that there has to be a way around that. We have come a little way.

May I say that I have tried to learn French. I have studied for six years in school and university. It did not work and I have tried since I have been at Queen's Park. I do not seem to be a linguist; I am not saying I am finished trying. I do have a daughter who is very bilingual, actually, in France at the moment studying.

But I would like to say to you how important it is for the anglophone community of Ontario to hear your mes-sage. You have given a message that is very different. We have not had a group of principals from any school system come before us till this point tonight. A lot of the franco-phone presenters have given very strong, poignant messages. Many people in Ontario have not had the opportunity to have this for the 18 years that I have had. I feel that my understanding has come through interpretation and so I hope that you will see that although there is a downside, this is a very crucial moment for people to understand what you are saying and to understand that you are saying the same thing for francophone children in Ontario as anglo-phones say for their children. So I just say that to you.

1940

My question to you is that I asked teachers, I think it was in Sudbury, "Would you be using the document that we have in your schools, the document that we are using as a basis for our discussions, Changing for the Better?" Have you used this within the school?

Ms Lapointe: Indeed I can speak for myself. We have received it at school. I have tried to make the older stu-dents aware of the mandate of the select committee, and the teachers of course are all aware of the existence of the committee and the reasons for its existence.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I hope you will pursue this because I do think that every student should be given an opportunity to know that it exists and I am sure that many of your teachers, particularly your history teachers and your political science teachers, would find it—so I would encourage you to offer it in your schools.

Mme Lapointe : Absolument. Merci, j'apprécie votre commentaire.

M. le Président : Au nom du comité je voudrais expli-quer, comme je l'ai fait cet après-midi, que la question de la traduction est quelque chose sur laquelle on va se pencher pour voir s'il y a d'autres solutions. Mais en ce moment, la situation est que le réseau parlementaire diffuse dans les deux langues, en français et en anglais. C'est donc aux compagnies de cablodistribution de choisir la langue dans laquelle elles vont diffuser au public. C'est là le problème. Peut-être y a-t-il d'autres choses que nous pouvons faire. On va examiner ça et j'espère qu'on va trouver une autre solution.

Mme Lapointe : On est patient, Monsieur Silipo. Merci.

CHRIS CUTLER

The Chair: Could I call next Chris Cutler.

M. Cutler : Monsieur le Président et membres du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, je vous remercie ce soir pour l'occasion de vous parler, surtout des grandes questions sur l'avenir de ce pays et sur la province de l'Ontario.

Malheureusement, on m'avait expliqué que j'avais 15 minutes ce soir pour ma présentation, alors je ferai de mon mieux pour le faire en 10 minutes.

I would like to begin once again by simply thanking the committee for the opportunity this evening to join in the public discussion being held at this exciting juncture in the history of Ontario and Canada, and exciting it is; exciting indeed because in the midst of conflicting views and visions, in the midst of doubts and despair, lie hope and opportunity, hope for a better Canada in which to live and an opportunity for countless citizens of every race, creed, colour, language and generation to forge together a future that better represents and reflects the hopes and aspirations of all who live in this great land, exciting because I am not yet prepared to lend my voice to the rising chorus of voices on all sides who see only failure and inevitable divorce ahead.

One can only be saddened to hear the likes of great Canadians such as Stephen Lewis and Oscar Peterson in recent statements surrender to the spirit of inevitability. Great nations are not built on the inevitability of failure, but by forging a consensus of common aspirations and expectations for the nation. For all too long, Canadians and indeed Ontarians have defined themselves not so much by who and what we are as by who and what we are not.

We are Canadians because we no longer are British or French or Chinese or Ukrainian. We are Canadians because we are not quite Americans, because by accident of birth or fate or immigration we find ourselves north of the United States. Seemingly we are Canadians because we have not yet mastered the art of the sitcom, as we have been told of late, because Mary Richards of the Mary Tyler Moore Show hails from Minneapolis-St Paul and not Winnipeg or Thunder Bay.

We are Canadians because somehow we are told we lack the drive and ambition of our neighbours to the south. Growing up like many young Canadians within easy reach of television signals emanating from the United States, much of that definition was formed through the 22-inch screen of a black-and-white Cyclops that dominated the living room of our home, as it did the homes of many who sheltered the first television generation of this nation, a medium that showed us more of the streets of LA and New York, Chicago and Boston than it did of the streets of Toronto, Vancouver or Montreal, a world view that was shaped from an earliest age by Captain Kangaroo and Sesame Street until Walter Cronkite's trademark, "And that's the way it is," became indeed the way it was for countless Canadians and many like myself who grew up knowing more about fires burning in North Tonawanda than what was going on in the east end of Hamilton.

Having had the opportunity to live in Europe for several years, I came away with a new definition, a new identity or

perhaps a new sense of national self-image, a view of Canada shaped not by the void of what we are not, so much as by what we really and truly are.

When President George Bush spoke of a kinder, gentler nation, he spoke, I believe, in many ways of an idea that collectively we as Canadians have already attained, a road that we have covered together in advance of our neighbours to the south. If we could only see ourselves in the world view us. Some cynics in Canada have described us as the self-proclaimed Boy Scouts to the world. Others would describe us perhaps more realistically, as sensible, sober, good citizens of the international community, prepared to carry our full load.

I recall being amazed at how many Europeans, particularly in France where I lived, claimed to have fought on the battlefields of two world wars side by side with Canadian troops, so many that in order to accept that fact, I was forced to upwardly raise the numbers of Canadian troops. I had always understood had served during those two particular conflicts. At the end of my sojourn in Europe, I returned to Canada convinced that I was privileged to live in the freest, most generous and opportunity-laden land on the face of the earth, as chauvinistic and un-Canadian as that might seem in its open expression.

I am here this evening due in some part to a sense of alienation that has been mine since the months leading up to the passage and signing of the Canada Act of 1982 which transferred to the Canadian Parliament the power to amend our Constitution, commonly referred to as the patriation of our Constitution, and the subsequent passage of the Constitution Act of 1982, which includes of course the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which for the first time entrenched our individual rights and freedoms including freedom of religion, assembly, association and the press as rights, among them legal, democratic, equality, language and mobility. It is certainly a pleasure to be able to sit here and exercise one of those rights this evening.

But what troubled me most as a young Canadian at that particular time was the sense of frustration and inability to grapple with the issues of the day and perhaps make myself known or express them, to in fact have a voice or a say in the kind of Canada in which I was to live and raise a family, to work and to give my time, my energy, my heart and my soul, afraid that the Canada I would live in would have been shaped simply by a few individuals, all male, another generation and all with another definition of Canada perhaps not shared by many across the country.

I recall my frustration as I realized that the direction of Canada was being determined by possibly three individuals. I am thinking of the time of Jean Chrétien, Roy Romanow and Roy McMurtry, who hammered out the kitchen deal that closed the issue of the 1982 Constitution Act and the Canada Act.

Casting about for thoughts to share with you this evening I do not represent any particular group. I do not particularly represent any political stream or any particular thoughts other than my own this evening. But in casting about, I think inevitably I turned my attention to history. In his book, *The National Dream*, Pierre Berton quotes Alexander Mackenzie, the Liberal leader and second Prime

finister of Canada, in the debates on the national railway in the 1870s, in which he described the national dream of a railway from coast to coast as an act of insane recklessness. I think that there are those outside of this country who would suggest that the process of dismemberment upon which many have embarked at this time across the country is an equally insane act of recklessness. If indeed there were to be an insane dream to dream of a united Canada, then I would rather dream that dream than not dream at all.

950

Some 120 years ago, sentiments similar to the ones we had today were being expressed. I quote the *Globe* from 1870, "Canada, except by a mere play on words, is not a nation." William Canniff wrote in 1875 that after Confederation there was "a hope that the petty warfare faction would be entirely submerged in a common Canadian sentiment, but this hope was short-lived." Goldwin Smith, an Oxford professor who resided at the Grange during the 1870s wrote, "The province, the sect, Orangism, Fenianism, Free Masonry, Odd Fellowship are more to the ordinary Canadian than Canada."

Perhaps one of the most disturbing developments in the wake of the failure of the Meech Lake accord has been the widening of the just-let-them-go attitude outside Quebec. Since you are asking what Ontario's role should be in the future of this Confederation and the Dominion of Canada, would I simply plead that our role be one of reconciliation, of outreach, of the extended hand, that we rise above our own history, and that we serve as examples of the hopes that all Canadians have for a united Canada.

I oft-times think that the failure of this nation to remain together as we enter the 1990s would be a failure that would be felt around the world. The inability of the peoples of this great nation to reconcile themselves to each other, to the realities of this nation, would be a failure that would be seen by other warring peoples engaged in religious and linguistic conflict throughout the world.

We have the opportunity to forge in this country a nation in circumstances that have brought failure in other parts of the world. Sri Lanka and Northern Ireland are two instances that come to mind.

Another development that has been particularly troubling for me has been the equation or definition of Canada as some kind of balance sheet, as some kind of profit-and-loss statement. I think it is unfortunate that the partners of Confederation have chosen to evaluate their place within Confederation on the basis of what they put into it and what they get out of it.

It is difficult to pack that 15 minutes into 10. Perhaps I might in conclusion simply state that regardless of the fate of this country, or the fate of this province, whether Quebec leaves Canada or not, whether the western provinces choose or choose not to drift into the United States or the Farthings are able to make a go of it on their own, these are all academic questions to me personally. Should Canada ever cease to be as a political entity, the fact of being a Canadian would never cease to be.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

LES CENTRES D'ALPHABÉTISATION DU SUD DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: Could I call next Sylvie Lemay, Raymond Morin and Roger Robillard des Centres d'alphabétisation du sud de l'Ontario.

While they are coming up, could I also point out that Don Abel, MPP for Wentworth North, has also joined us.

M. Morin : Membres de la commission Silipo, mesdames, messieurs, bonsoir. Nous aimerions vous remercier pour l'occasion de nous présenter et de vous exprimer ici nos désirs. Notre délégation représente les centres d'alphabétisation du sud de l'Ontario, c'est-à-dire, le centre de la péninsule du Niagara, l'ABC communautaire ; le centre Alpha-Huronie de Penetang, Alphana de Windsor, Alpha-Toronto et Alpha-Hamilton.

Je suis accompagné ce soir de Roger Robillard, président du Centre de l'ABC communautaire de Niagara et de Sylvie Lemay, coordonnatrice d'Alpha-Hamilton et ancienne animatrice bénévole en alphabétisation. Je suis Raymond Morin, membre du comité Alpha-Hamilton, enseignant au niveau intermédiaire à l'école Notre-Dame de Hamilton.

Ensemble, nous allons vous communiquer la situation des analphabètes franco-ontariens et des centres d'alphabétisation populaires en exposant les faits saillants. M. Robillard vous présentera les faits vécus et entendus par des apprenants en alphabétisation.

M. Robillard : J'aimerais commencer avec une petite histoire. Marie-Christine est l'aînée d'une grande famille de huit enfants. À sept ans elle commence à aller à la petite école. Elle aime beaucoup ça et réussit assez bien. Quelques années plus tard elle doit quitter l'école pour aider à la maison. La famille est pauvre, il y a beaucoup de travail à faire. Éventuellement, Marie-Christine se marie et quitte le foyer paternel pour demeurer avec son mari. Son mari prend bien soin d'elle. Malheureusement, après 35 ans de mariage, son mari meurt. Marie se retrouve seule. Elle est incapable de lire sa facture. Elle ne sait qui payer. Elle ne sait même pas comment écrire un chèque. Elle se retrouve perdue.

Où encore une autre histoire. Jean a quinze ans. Il a étudié en neuvième année et ne réussit pas, se décourage et quitte l'école pour aller travailler. Il est accepté à l'usine. Il travaille l'acier ; c'est un travail dur mais Jean est fort. Un peu plus tard Jean se marie. Il a des enfants. On lui offre une promotion à l'ouvrage avec plus de responsabilité. Jean refuse en bredouillant. Comment expliquer au foreman qu'il ne lit pas assez bien pour être capable de lire les directives pour le corps ? Quand même, Jean continue à travailler fort. Un jour sa petite deuxième lui demande : « Papa, lis-moi une histoire ». Jean est frustré. Il est incapable d'accepter d'autres responsabilités à l'ouvrage ; il n'est même pas capable de lire une histoire d'enfants à sa petite fille. Que faire ?

Ces histoires que je vous raconte sont des collectes d'expérience dont on a témoignées des apprenants dans les ateliers d'alphabétisation. Nous les partageons avec vous pour que vous puissiez comprendre un peu le contexte des analphabètes.

En Ontario, d'après le southern literacy report, le taux d'alphabétisme complet et fonctionnel chez les anglo-

phones serait de 23%. Pour les francophones, le taux s'élève à 29%. Il y a même des statistiques récentes de Statistique Canada qui indiqueraient que le taux canadien d'analphabétisme complet et fonctionnel serait aussi haut que 38%. En plus, la majorité des études indique que les Franco-Ontariens ont un taux d'analphabétisme plus élevé que la moyenne.

Pourquoi un taux si élevé chez les Franco-Ontariens ? Les raisons en sont variées. Le taux d'analphabétisme est relié à l'histoire sociale, économique et politique de la minorité franco-ontarienne, surtout en ce qui a trait aux droits linguistiques et scolaires. Les Franco-Ontariens font la majeure partie des couches ouvrières et agricoles et sont économiquement faibles. Ces conditions, en conjonction avec le Règlement 17, qui pendant longtemps interdisait l'enseignement en français et le monopole de l'anglais dans les écoles secondaires jusqu'en 1968, ont eu l'effet de maintenir les Franco-Ontariens dans une condition d'analphabétisme. Cet alphabétisme a laissé les Franco-Ontariens dans une condition d'analphabétisme. Cet alphabétisme est un des éléments qui a laissé les Franco-Ontariens dans la marginalité sociale, culturelle, politique, économique et linguistique.

Cet alphabétisme est dangereux. Le fléau de l'analphabétisme affecte toute notre société. Ici au Canada on estime que l'analphabétisme coûte environ 10,7 milliards de dollars par année. Nous, comme société, dépensons des sommes incroyables d'argent à cause de l'analphabétisme. Je cite comme exemples les coûts de l'assurance sociale et de l'assurance-chômage. Un certain pourcentage de la population ne peut se trouver un emploi car elle est incapable de lire ou d'écrire. Il y a aussi le coût de nombreux accidents au travail causés par l'analphabétisme. Si on est incapable de suivre les instructions de sécurité ou les instructions pour bien opérer une machinerie, il y a danger d'accident.

Alors, l'alphabétisation nous coûte énormément cher. Elle coûte au gouvernement et à l'industrie des millions et des millions de dollars. En plus, comment évaluer le coût au plan social ? La frustration et le mécontentement de l'individu qui ne sait pas lire ni écrire ou qui, en d'autres mots, ne peut pas fonctionner à 100 % dans notre société doivent être énormément grands.

Il y a aussi d'autres coûts. Les analphabètes sont moins susceptibles de fournir un vote éclairé ou seulement de faire valoir leurs droits comme citoyens. D'après le southern literacy report, les analphabètes sont aussi moins susceptibles de participer à des clubs et à des organismes, ce qui affaiblit une société, notre culture franco-ontarienne aussi bien que la culture canadienne. Ce ne sont que des exemples de ce que nous coûte l'analphabétisme.

Les centres d'alphabétisation populaire francophone aident les Franco-Ontariens analphabètes à exploiter leur potentiel au niveau du code écrit, de la lecture et du calcul. Notre philosophie de base est celle de l'éducation populaire. C'est-à-dire, à travers les ateliers d'alphabétisation, nous espérons permettre aux analphabètes apprenants de notre communauté à y prendre leur place.

L'alphabétisation populaire permet aux analphabètes de se prendre en main et de développer des mécanismes pour poursuivre leurs aspirations de travail, leurs aspirations

personnelles et leurs rêves les plus chers. Alors, Marie-Christine, qui avait perdu son mari, est capable d'apprendre à survivre et de s'intégrer dans la communauté. Jean est finalement capable d'accéder au poste avec plus de responsabilités et aussi de lire une histoire à ses enfants.

Sylvie Lemay vous tracera maintenant l'historique des centres Alpha en Ontario.

2000

Mlle Lemay : Depuis le début de notre histoire canadienne, les Canadiens français ont travaillé à la formation du pays. Avec les Anglais et les autochtones, nous avons défriché et cultivé la terre, nous avons peuplé le pays, découvert ses richesses et bâti le Canada. Ceci pour dire que les Canadiens français sont une des communautés historiques fondatrices du Canada et que ces liens historiques nous méritent une place au sein de ses lois et de sa constitution.

Cependant, malgré que le Canada se dit officiellement bilingue, malgré l'existence de la loi ontarienne sur les services en français, nous percevons qu'il a existé et qu'il existe encore des manques à l'égard de la communauté franco-ontarienne. Les lois qui garantissent les services en français ne sont presque que du tape-à-l'oeil, surtout lorsqu'on prend en considération tous les gestes antifrancophones de la part de nos gouvernements durant les 100 derniers ans.

Il faut quand même dire que malgré toutes les interdictions et les proclamations contre les Franco-Ontariens qui ont été présentées par divers niveaux de gouvernement durant le dernier siècle, les Franco-Ontariens se sont obstinés à continuer à vivre leur langue et de faire valoir leurs droits. Tout ceci pour vous dire que les Franco-Ontariens ont le droit de s'affirmer et de vivre leur culture, de vivre leur langue et de garder leur identité de Franco-Ontariens.

Maintenant, avec la séparation possible du Québec, il y a plusieurs rumeurs que cela sera la fin de la francophonie hors Québec. Nous sommes très conscients qu'il y a des groupes qui font pression auprès du gouvernement pour éliminer les services en français. Nous sommes ici pour vous dire que nous avons notre place ici en Ontario. Il faut que je vous dise que ma famille se trouve ici au Canada depuis 1646. Nous sommes en Ontario depuis 1870 ; cela fait six générations. Pour moi et pour tous les Franco-Ontariens, ici c'est mon chez-moi, c'est notre chez-nous. Nous voulons y rester et nous voulons continuer à y vivre en français comme l'ont fait nos ancêtres.

Cependant, nous ne voulons pas vivre les mêmes conditions d'injustices qu'ils ont vécues. Nous voulons vivre en Ontario à part entière et jouir des mêmes droits que nos confrères anglophones. Aujourd'hui, nous soulignons les manques au niveau de l'éducation et plus spécifiquement en alphabétisation. Les structures déjà existantes sont un début.

Cependant, nous croyons que ces structures ont besoin d'être renforcées et garanties. Lorsqu'il s'agit d'éducation la minorité francophone ne devrait pas être menacée par les coupures et les changements de gouvernement ou politiques. Il est nécessaire de faire respecter nos droits et dans ce cas particulier, notre droit à l'éducation dans notre langue maternelle, c'est-à-dire en français. Ceci inclut

roît de s'alphabétiser et de s'éduquer en français. Pour garantir ces droits, nous avons besoin de meilleurs mécanismes de soutien de la part des gouvernements ontarien et fédéral. Nous avons besoin de nous ancrer de façon politique et constitutionnelle au sein de la Confédération et de la province. Peut importe ce qui se passe au Québec, nous sommes une partie intégrale de l'Ontario.

M. Robillard : Encore une fois, messieurs, messames, membres du comité, merci de votre attention.

ROMAN MARCH

The Chair: Could I call next Dr Roman March?

Mr March: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, I want to thank you for coming to McMaster. The last time I appeared before a legislative committee I had to travel to Toronto, so I am rather overwhelmed to see the entire committee here.

Anyway, I am a professor here at McMaster University in the department of political science. I am a specialist in the history and politics of Canada, western and eastern Europe and the United States of America. I have taught a senior level course on Quebec's political, social and constitutional politics for the past 20 years. I am delighted to see one of my former pupils sitting over here.

I would like to first give a brief overview of, or introduction to, the brief. First I am going to present the present constitutional crisis in historical perspective. Second, I will draw some conclusions about the history of the constitutional crisis which we face, and finally I will address questions 1 to 8, not 3 to 8 as listed on page 3 of the Ontario Government's public discussion paper, *Changing for the Better*. I presume that is what we are here for. For the historical perspective, it will only be a page and a half.

Once again, the northern half of the North American continent is facing a crisis over the legitimacy of its geographic boundaries, political structures and institutions and the division of legislative powers. I say "once again" because the present crisis of legitimacy is only one of a long list of many such crises which have confronted previous political regimes. Many of the former crises were deeply violent, especially during the series of wars between the European imperial powers as they struggled for possession of the Americas, and these struggles were among themselves and with the aboriginal inhabitants.

Let me list a few of the more significant crises that have occurred since the conquest of *Nouveau France* in 1760. There was a royal proclamation of 1763 which still is part of the constitutional regime of Canada, and which recognized certain of the Indian tribes as sovereign nations. Then there was the Quebec Act of 1774 which entrenched linguistic and religious freedoms for the French colonialists wherever they resided under the protection of the British flag. Aboriginal sovereignty and the rights of the French language have never been extinguished, although they have been subjected to attacks over the centuries right up to the present day.

The Constitutional Act of 1791 granted to the refugees who poured into British North America after the American Revolution the right to elect their own Legislature. This right to vote was also extended to French Canadians and

Catholics at the time when such rights were denied to Catholic citizens in the United Kingdom itself. When this regime failed to meet the demands of those who wanted responsible government, the rebellions of 1837 occurred in Upper and Lower Canada. The Act of Union of 1840 attempted to assimilate French Canadians into an English and Protestant culture. That union, too, failed and was replaced by the British North America Act of 1867. That constitutional regime of 1867 in turn was shaken to its foundation by the two rebellions in the Canadian northwest, both led by Louis Riel in 1869 and 1885.

Conscription crises in the First World War and the Second World War, the imposition of the War Measures Act in Quebec in 1970, the Quebec referendum on sovereignty-association in 1980, the Constitution Act of 1982 which gave us the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as well as the amending formula which led to the collapse of Meech Lake accord and now the Allaire report of 28 January 1991, have all shaken successive political regimes.

What conclusions? Let's stop shaking, to put it mildly. I just pause to note that some people say Canadian history is dull. I have never found it dull. I have been astounded by it.

What should this long catalogue of constitutional crises teach us? What it tells me is that we should not be overwhelmed by the seeming enormity and intractability of the current constitutional crisis. Amen.

I will now turn to the specific questions raised by the document that has been circulated. By the way, I thank the committee and the members of the Legislature for responding to my request and sending me hundreds of copies of it, and I have circulated them to any person who walks around with two hands held out. Anyway, we will leave it at that.

Questions for discussion, page 3 of the document:

1. What are the values we share as Canadians? I am going to suggest that these are best expressed for non-francophones in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. There is serious debate in Quebec whether the charter provisions regarding language rights should apply to Quebec or should be entrenched in the Quebec Constitution. Again, I refer you to the Allaire report.

2010

2. How can we secure our future in the international economy? I will pass on this one, except to ask whether we must lock our economy into an American-dominated trading bloc in order to go to economic war with the European Community and Japan.

3. What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? Now we are into the heart of the matter. The federal government should maintain control over fiscal and monetary policy, but it must develop formal institutions where provincial and/or regional voices can be heard and counted. One could look to the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, especially to the role of the Bundesrat, or the federal house, as models for central government/provincial decision-making.

The federal government will have to return to the provinces control over post-secondary education, health and welfare, manpower, unemployment insurance and cultural

matters, as was the case in 1867. This is, will be, the heart of the question of the transfer of powers. In doing so, this would meet some of Quebec's concerns as expressed in the Allaire report, and, as well, these things will likely be recommended by the Bélanger-Campeau commission, which will be reporting in a week or two, 28 March presumably.

4. How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? Again, I would say we should return to the concept of sovereignty envisaged in the royal proclamation of 1763. I would suggest that we look at the definitive study of this matter by Professor Bruce Clark, who is an expert, probably the pre-eminent expert in this area, and the book is *Native Liberty, Crown Sovereignty: The Existing Aboriginal Right of Self-Government in Canada*. Professors love long titles. It will never be a popular seller, but it should be read and looked at by all those concerned about this matter.

Serious consideration must be given to the argument made by the Cree of northern Quebec about their right to secede from Quebec should Quebec make a unilateral declaration of independence under a government led by the Parti québécois or as the result of a Quebec referendum on sovereignty or total independence. My question is this: can the government of Canada take back the territory given to Quebec in 1912, or does Ontario take the position that all provincial boundaries are inviolable? That is to muddy the waters a bit.

The Vice-Chair: You have about a minute left.

Mr March: Okay.

The Vice-Chair: There is a question if you want to take a question.

Mr March: Sure. Well, you have the written brief. I do suggest that anybody who tries to predict what is going to happen in the next year or two—excuse my language in the brief, but it says, “is a fool,” so please do not ask me that.

Ms Churley: I perhaps should not have made you stop for what I am about to say, but it is more of a quick statement. We have to be very clear on our history, and on page 2 where it says, “This right to vote was also extended to French Canadians and Catholics,” I hasten to add, to French Canadian and Catholic men. To some people, that is a petty point.

Mr March: Mea culpa.

Ms Churley: To me, it is very important that we include and remember those kinds of things when we talk about our history. Thank you.

Mr March: Okay.

The Vice-Chair: We are unfortunately out of time.

Mr March: Okay. Yes, I understand.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

BUSINESS COUNCIL FOR FAIR TRADE

The Vice-Chair: We would like to recognize, first of all, for the members of the committee and those who are watching, Dave Christopherson, the member from Hamilton Centre, who has just joined us. We would like next to call the Business Council for Fair Trade, Jim Conrad.

Mr Conrad: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the select committee. With me tonight I have a student from one of the local high schools in Etobicoke.

As you can see from the written submission that has been distributed to you, our submission covers many points. My time plan is to briefly cover the points that are in the brief but to focus on the question and the issue and the discussion of including economic rights in the Canadian Constitution.

This brief, in short, is a proposal for a new vision for Canada. It covers the points that Canada must be sovereign and independent, that it must be united, that human dignity must be preserved, that Canadians desire peace. Just to pause there for a moment, those two phrases are drawn word for word from the Japanese Constitution and the German Constitution, and you will see the heavy influence that there is in this brief on the constitutions of those two countries, which obviously I have great respect for and highly recommend to this committee for detailed study.

Canadians want a distinct Canadian culture. We are spiritual people. We touch on the importance of ownership which is a theme that I will return to.

Much has been made of the fundamental importance to Canadians of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which we endorse, but when you study other constitutions of the world and also study the United Nations charter, you realize that, as good as our present charter is, it is most inadequate to what I call the new vision for Canada.

First is to clearly state our belief that Canadians are a distinctive people. To support that contention, the submission identifies 11 major characteristics of the Canadian identity which make us distinctive, which are, just to list our conservatism; our sense of collectivism; statism; elitism; we are a freedom-loving people; we are economically schizophrenic; we have unhappiness of a tolerance of economic dependence; we are a prudent people; we are service-oriented; we are non-violent and peaceful, and we are tolerant and compromising. I submit that these characteristics are what make us a distinctive people.

2020

In the German Constitution, the first 20 articles cannot be amended—period. I submit to you that part of which should be in the new vision for Canada is basic rights which cannot be amended, that are put beyond the reach of Parliament. There are some omissions to our present charter and I touch on those briefly—the questions of marriage and family, the home, the rights of children. These are obviously fruitful areas for further discussion.

Much of the present discussion in the media focuses on the Allaire report and the Bélanger-Campeau commission and we want to dismiss that very quickly. The question being raised, “What federal powers need to be conceded to Quebec in order to keep Quebec in Canada?” We reject both these proposals and the premise of the question.

We must not negotiate on the basis of Quebec's proposals. Rather, Canadians coast to coast should develop consensus on a new vision for Canada, based on the premise of a strong central government. We want, we must have, a sovereign country. If Quebec joins us, there will be rejoicing. If not, then they will go their own way, regretfully.

A particular focus of the discussion is linguistic rights, and we propose that whether the new Canada includes Quebec or not, Canada continue its policy of official bilingualism. The new federal Parliament without Quebec should continue to have English and French with equal status. This is the one distinctive characteristic of Canada. It is fundamental that both French-speaking and English Canadians see all of Canada as their homeland, from sea to sea to sea. In this new Canada, Ontario as well as New Brunswick would be officially bilingual.

There is nothing radical about this. India has 18 official languages. Linguistic minorities are protected in the UN charter. The Constitution of Austria, for example, gives the Slovene and Croat minorities in that predominantly German society the right to use their languages in public on government signs and on businesses. And does an anglophone from Quebec? I can only view the suppression of English by Quebec as not only contrary to the United Nations covenants on civil and political rights but as evidence of an immature society lacking in self-confidence.

There is a series of proposals to strengthen the federal government. The models once again are the constitutions of Germany and Japan. These countries are not only self-evidently extremely strong world economic powers but have social welfare programs generally as good as or better than Canada. As a strong economy, you can afford the necessary social programs.

You can read down the list. Federal law shall override provincial law. Education in both the principles and standards of both Germany and Japan is a national responsibility. The formation and the role of political parties is entrenched in the Constitution. Immigration should be an exclusive federal responsibility, as there is only one basis for Canadian citizenship. There should be established a federal constitutional court to interpret the Constitution. Both the Japanese and German constitutions allow for impeachment of public officials who violate the provisions of the constitutions.

Of particular concern is the increasing degradation of the environment, and I submit that the right to a clean and healthy environment should be put beyond the reach of Parliament to amend, as with other fundamental rights. Once you put the environment as a federal responsibility, when the federal government must by definition have exclusive jurisdiction over air, water and soil.

We express concern about the duplication of federal and provincial governments and in our view it is the provincial governments that are going to have to cut back so that taxation of Canadians can decrease.

On the question of aboriginal rights, in order to bring dignity to the aboriginal peoples it is simply—the German Constitution once again is the model, where there are communes guaranteed the right to self-government and with the right of taxation and the right to run their own educational system. In order to bring dignity to the aboriginal peoples, the federal and provincial governments simply have to delegate powers to the aboriginal peoples and then cut back on the entrenched bureaucracies in those two governments.

Proposals for Senate reform are to be elected, representative and equal. We do not support the concept of a Senate

that has equal representation, say, from Prince Edward Island and Alberta.

We outline the fatal flaw of Meech, which is basically—and you can knock on any door across the country and hear the same theme—aren't all Canadians equal?

In the few minutes that are left, I want to focus on economic rights, which is the unfinished agenda in our Constitution. If you go back, you will find that the Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, as Minister of Justice, wrote that "the guarantee of economic rights placed in a charter beyond the reach of amendment by Parliament is desirable. However, it is advisable not to attempt inclusion of economic rights at this time." Given that it took 15 years to get a reasonable set of individual, political, linguistic, mobility, legal rights in the Constitution, I guess he was tactically correct.

But at what cost to Canadian citizens have we ignored proposals for economic rights? What value is freedom of expression if you do not have a job? Once again, it is instructive to understand that both Germany and Japan, each an economic powerhouse, have entrenched economic rights and freedoms. We could do worse than adopt a successful model.

These are some of the economic rights that we are proposing for a new vision of Canada: the right and the obligation to work; protection against unemployment; right to form and join trade unions; right to social security; right to rest and leisure; right to an adequate standard of living; right to education; right to ownership of homes and businesses; right to share in profits.

It has been the experience of the United Nations that inclusion of economic rights lags behind the inclusion of individual and legal and political rights in constitutions. Why is this? I go into a historical perspective here on Japan. You can do the same sort of historical perspective on Germany.

2030

In Japan in the 1930s economic power concentrated in the hands of a few families called the *Zaibatsu*. When Japan was developing its war machine, it was easy to control the financial and economic and industrial resources of that country to focus it on waging war.

The US occupation forces knew this, and in 1947 the US occupation forces imposed stronger antitrust laws on Japan than the United States itself had. These prohibited restraints of trade, unfair business practices, price discriminations, mergers and acquisitions—the whole long list of antitrust activity—but the intention and the result and what was achieved was to break up the *Zaibatsu* into a competitive economy that I submit was an absolutely crucial precondition to the Japanese postwar economic miracle.

Exactly the same thing happened in Germany. Both Germany and Japan have stronger—much stronger—antitrust laws than Canada. Germany has constitutional provisions to prevent the abuse of economic power.

Obviously the communist command system does not work. I submit to you that the free-enterprise system, although it is better than the communist system, also has flaws because it allows and leads to concentrations of economic power due to the inherent greed in individuals.

What we need to do is talk about what we call fair enterprise, fair competition, fair trade, so that we can deal with these concentrations of economic power which, if allowed to continue to grow in Canada, and there is some evidence that it has already happened, will lead to a loss of our political freedom.

Now, we get economic rights in the Constitution. What in fact will be the practical result of this? I suggest to you that one immediate result of doing that would be abrogation of the Canada-US free trade agreement because it would violate constitutional provisions for economic justice and economic freedom, and of course abolishing the free trade agreement would be lower interest rates, a lower value for the Canadian dollar and a return to prosperity.

The new vision for Canada—and I am just wrapping up—would emphasize fair enterprise, participation in ownership and profit, family and community values and co-ordination of Canadian society by a supportive government. The *cri de coeur* of Canadians is for a constituent assembly to put all this relatively sterile discussion of—behind us and to develop a new vision for Canada that will lead to a prosperous and healthy country for the 21st century.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear before this committee, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Conrad, for certainly one of the most extensive presentations that we have had. A great deal of preparation has obviously gone into this brief. We appreciate that very much. There is some time for questions. Mr Winninger.

Mr Winninger: Yes. Thank you too for that very well researched and comprehensive brief. I am sure it will be of great value to us. I just wanted to zero in on one of your recommendations on page 4, which was for a federal constitutional court separate from the courts of ministry and justice.

You may have heard the criticism of the power that is conferred on our judges under the charter. Some think it is far too wide. Some have criticized the judges themselves for tending to be upper-class, Anglo-Saxon, élitist judges interpreting human rights and freedoms, rather than the Parliament having more control over that. I am just wondering what kind of safeguards you might build into your model for a federal constitutional court that might meet some of those criticisms that are levelled at our judges as they exist now, because it would seem to me you might be creating an even more élitist court which would just interpret the Constitution.

Mr Conrad: I understand the comments and my answer would be no, I do not think so, because first you get the Constitution and the judges' role as learned individuals would be to interpret the Constitution that has been given to them by the people of Canada. If a judge was élitist and there is unhappiness, article 64 of the Constitution of Japan is perhaps the best answer: "The Diet"—which is the Parliament—"shall set up an impeachment court from among the members of both houses for the purpose of trying those judges against whom removal proceedings have been instituted." So you set up a way of basically impeaching judges in accordance with the Constitution.

Mr Winninger: Thank you for your comments.

Mr Offer: Jim, thank you for your presentation. A has been said, it is a comprehensive document which I am going to take some time to read through, and I am certain all members of the committee will in fact do that. When you talk about your new vision for Canada, I am struck by that which appears on page 3, which talks about the negotiation between the federal government and Quebec. You have stated that we must not negotiate on the basis of Quebec's proposals, and then it goes on to talk about all of the new things in terms of your new vision.

My question is, before we get to that aspect of the new vision, is there any basis in your presentation that contemplates negotiation with the province of Quebec? Is there anything that you see as the basis for the federal government talking to Quebec on some of those things that the province needs and desires? I ask this because I hear someone state that the best way that one can guarantee change from the status quo is to state that we insist on the status quo, and I am just wondering if there is in your presentation any ground, any way that the federal government can talk to Quebec.

Mr Conrad: Yes, we are proposing a negotiation here. It was President Kennedy who said we must not fear to negotiate. We are saying to develop our own negotiating position, our own new vision for Canada so that we are sure we have a country with or without Quebec, then go to Quebec and say: "Here is our vision for Canada. We have all these wonderful things in terms of charter and economic freedoms, economic justice." Invite them to come in. As you know, I am not only not a fan of Meech Lake, I am not a fan of Jeffrey Simpson who keeps pushing this—this is not a status quo. This is a long way, this is a radical reform. I am saying to basically wipe the table clean, find out what in fact makes up Canada, the distinctive characteristics in the Constitution and the identity and symbol that we want. Then, when we are comfortable, negotiate with Quebec.

Who speaks for Quebec? Je suis un Québécois, je parle anglais. I have got family, I have got friends, I have got businessmen in Quebec. Do you think those businessmen in Quebec who oppose the free trade deal, who oppose Meech Lake, could ever get on the CBC to articulate those views? The media only put forward the myth that all businessmen from Quebec support the trade deal and support Meech Lake. It is not true. Ce n'est pas vrai. The few politicians who get all the media coverage do not speak for the anglophones of Quebec who elected the Equality Party to the National Assembly; they do not speak for all the Greeks up and down Park Avenue; they do not speak for the Jewish community in Montreal. Who do they speak for?

CBC phoned me the other day and gasoline prices are 47 cents a litre in Toronto and 69 cents a litre in Montreal. I said, "Will a sovereign Quebec mean lower gasoline prices?" and the answer is no. They are proposing an increase of 5 cents a litre in the taxation in Montreal. This debate is not about rights; it is about taxation powers, and the Quebec government is way over spending. That is the root of the problem, and the answer to your question

ve, is yes, we negotiate from our own well-thought-out position of strength.

The Chair: Okay, thank you very much. We will move on to the next presenter. Thanks very much again.

140

CHINESE CANADIAN SOCIETY OF HAMILTON-WENTWORTH-HALTON

The Chair: Could I check and see if Wally Mark is here from the Chinese Canadian Society of Hamilton-Wentworth-Halton?

Mr Mark: Thank you, Mr Chairman, for extending an invitation to the Chinese Canadian Society of Hamilton-Wentworth-Halton to share its views on Ontario's role in confederation. Before I begin, let me state for the public record that our association appreciates being granted this opportunity to speak for the public record on a subject that is all been too often been contextualized as an English and French debate.

This, in my mind, is far too simplistic. The issue of Canada remaining as a strong and united country has less to do with the preservation of language and culture of any one ethnic group, Chinese included, than it does with the advancement and preservation of fundamental principles embodied in our Constitution. For it is our Constitution and our Charter of Rights in particular, which define the values and aspirations of Canadians as a collection of individuals with varied religious, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.

This being said, I will not be commenting tonight on the merits of transferring certain powers from the federal government to the provinces or the current language laws in Quebec. To do so would only obfuscate the essence of the current challenges now facing our country. For at the centre at the current debate is tolerance and vision, something which Canadians should be proud their country has offered millions of people from a wide range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds. It is precisely tolerance and vision that I am afraid are sadly missing in the current and of constitutional manoeuvring.

As a representative of the Chinese community, I can tell you that for hundreds of thousands of Chinese Canadians, Canada has and will remain a beacon of tolerance, justice and opportunity. In the United States they call it liberty and freedom and dramatically wrap symbols around their country's past. The Statue of Liberty and the Liberty Bell are popular Americana aimed at reminding their citizens of their collective values and aspirations. Why are we Canadians not more proud of the fact that two cultures, English and French originally, and numerous other ethnic groups built prosperity out of forests, of trees, ice, snow, rivers and rock. We did this and we did it together, with tolerance for our obvious differences and by working together in the face of adversity.

The lesson here is that many Chinese immigrants who settled in Canada looked to this great country's past as a way of understanding their future. In doing so personally, I have always been struck by what a magnificent country this is. A story enormously rich with examples of co-operation,

strength and resolve among different ethnic groups to build something great.

Now with the current debate and threats of Quebec's separation, I can tell you that the Chinese community is saddened but most of all confused as to how a country as great as Canada could even contemplate dissolution. In reading and listening to federal politicians, the musings of scholars and other so-called informed experts, it strikes me that a great emphasis has been placed on defining the Canadian identity based on our accommodation of all ethnic groups. To me, this is neither a sound nor a responsible way of defining what it is to be Canadian, for this approach draws attention to our differences.

Certainly it is logical and correct to argue that tolerance and respect of other cultures is a hallmark of Canadian culture but it is not by itself an accurate definition of what it is to be a Canadian. Rather, it is merely a symptom of what Canada, as a civilized and sophisticated country, has become, and make no mistake about it, Canada is sophisticated and civilized. Just ask any one of the tens of thousands of immigrants who view Canada as the promised land after spending years in a refugee camp.

Now we are confronted today with the possibility that the promised land for thousands will be dissolved, will be divided up into small political units. And to what end? Maybe it is human nature that we are constantly trying to improve what we have, and I do not doubt for a moment that this too is what those in Quebec are seeking. I also know that the motivation to make Canada better, more united and stronger is a dream that the Chinese community shares, living proof of an enlightened and sophisticated society and a proud tradition of a country forged from reason and intellect, not from revolution.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you so much for bringing your perspective. I do not think that we have heard from the Chinese community by themselves. We have had members of the Chinese community present, but not representing the community as you have. Have you used the document, *Changing For the Better*, within the community? Have you discussed that issue?

Mr Mark: We have actually been discussing and reviewing over some time now what we are looking for. Are you referring to the specific document that is—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes. I just wondered.

Mr Mark: Yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could you tell me if you have any recommendations you think this committee could make? You have brought the problem as you see it. Have you any recommendations for the committee? Do you see any actions the committee could take that you feel would be helpful to the things you have presented to us?

Mr Mark: Could you be more specific in which points?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I guess I am asking you to be more specific.

Mr Mark: One of the questions has been the multi-cultural mosaic. Personally I find that Canada, while having a very, very enlightened policy, tends to promote differences

and that divides the country. Somewhere such as the United States, with their great melting pot, has a very simplistic approach, but practically it works because it tends to bind along common grounds rather than divide among their differences.

2050

Mr Offer: Just picking up from that last comment, are you in your presentation stating that we in our deliberations should look at the multicultural fabric of the country with a view to reassessing its worth or use in this country and taking a look at the United States as an example with its melting pot?

Mr Mark: As I understand it, the multicultural policy is an experiment anyhow and maybe it is time to reassess it and see where we can bolster it and where we can change it. Has it ever been reviewed?

Mr Offer: Just a quick follow-up. In the event that Quebec would leave and you have spoken about the real—it is hard to put in words how one feels about a unified country, but do you feel that that would impact on the multicultural fabric of the country? Would we be losing something, not just a province, but something more of a spirit?

Mr Mark: That is not something that I have given a lot of thought to multiculturally, but people tend to choose Canada; Canada does not choose its people. When you choose a country, hopefully you want to be good citizens within that country. I do not think people really give a lot of thought to Quebec separating when they land here. I take it the divisiveness impacts on them after they have been here for some time and it is somewhat confusing but it also is self-perpetuating. If you have unity, it perpetuates unity. If you have division, it perpetuates division. As I said, I am not really well versed as to how a separation of Quebec would affect us multiculturally. I am not sure that is a key issue either.

Mrs Witmer: Mr Mark, I would like to continue. You talk about the Canadian identity and the fact that we are spending a tremendous amount of time discussing our differences. You are not the first person that I have heard that from recently. There are many other ethnic groups in my own community that are saying the same thing. What do you feel we should be highlighting that makes us unique and makes us strong and would bring us together?

Mr Mark: Canada, historically speaking, is a relatively young country, and I believe that we are going through growing pains just like most countries have. Why do we not just find common ground and basically go with that? Everybody is different but when you stress the differences, it brings them to the forefront. While they are there, you may want to shuffle them back a little bit more.

Mrs Witmer: So I hear you saying then we should be concentrating on how we are the same, what makes us great.

Mr Mark: Well, a country is what you make of it. If you want to make it a divisive country you can, but on the other hand, if you want to unite it along common grounds, you can. Look at any wars. Enemies are united to fight a

common enemy. Why can we not unite along common lines?

The Chair: I guess the trick for all of us is to come with a common set of things that in fact we agree on that do unite us, and of course we heard a lot of discussion about the diversity being one of those things that in fact does unite us but that is—

Mr Mark: How about the common good of the country?

The Chair: Yes. Okay, thank you, Mr Mark.

We have at this point a number of other speakers and given the time, I am going to suggest that we can actually give all of those people an opportunity to speak to us. However, we agree that we can basically give each of the individuals about five minutes' time, that way we will be able to give everyone that is on the list an opportunity to speak with us.

EILEEN BUTSON

The Chair: I call first then Eileen Butson.

Ms Butson: Thank you. This province, indeed the whole country and we all are being directed towards a future undefined and unsought by the vast majority of people. Until 1981, Canada had a growing, adjusting, adapting society. The nation had an effective government within a framework of continuity and stability. Canadians had freedom and confidence. Now Parliament has lost the power used to have and change is being confused with progress.

There are many areas of concern. We have a loss of democracy, we have overpowered politicians, we have health service problems, educational problems, language problems, environmental problems, economic problems, employment problems, problems with the justice system, problems with loss of individual rights, loss of our family and society and loss of our heritage. All these areas of concern are intertwined and one affects the other. You cannot put them all in little packages. Any constitutional change should have the expressed consent of all the people governed and sensitive changes should only be made after a referendum. It is not legitimate for a government to order our lives for us.

Political power: All political parties should be limited by statute and tradition. Legislation should limit government spending and taxing. Health service insurance should be funded. There should be funds behind it, not the way it works now. Bills are just paid from our tax revenue. Why should we be forced to use only the state medical care system? Canada is the only western nation to outlaw private care. It is an outrage that the state forbids you to use your own resources to save your own life. By making it illegal for doctors to provide service privately, the state has usurped an entire profession and the freedoms of millions of patients. There should be no Bill 147 which will allow medical police to inspect all health facilities and records without a warrant.

Much of the demand for overservicing is patient driven. When some people believe a service is free, the demand usually exceeds the supply. Most of health care money is spent on people who suffer from lifestyle diseases.

ny socialized system designed to pay for consequences of carelessness and irresponsibility is unfair to those who are careful and responsible. There should be a small user fee for health service.

Education: The problem of illiteracy is in all our communities. It is serious. The school system needs to provide efficient intellectual nourishment. Attempts must be made to exercise, train and discipline the mind. Most parents want their children to emerge from school with a mind, a sense of the past and a moral code. We need more history turned to the schools. The children need to know about the political origins and there is a need for an inculcation of spiritual and moral values.

As far as the language has been concerned, official bilingualism has been imposed upon us. There is a difference between people having a right to think, write and publish in the language of their choice and the policy of forcing people to use a language against their will. Canada has been added to the watch list of Amnesty International because of the repression in Quebec. The official bilingual act should be repealed, certainly for Ontario. It is an unnecessary expense in this province. What official bilingualism is really about is power, and there is gross over-representation of French-speaking people in too many of the key government positions.

Then we go on to the environment. The population effect is the environmental steamroller. We have lots of space but we do not have the resources to accommodate our present population at our current level of consumption. Population growth requires continuously high resource inputs. We should only be taking the really needy people, the refugees. We do not need more people. Switzerland and Japan have had a zero population growth for years and they have been doing very well economically. Local governments must stop dumping raw sewage and road salt into our lakes and rivers. There should be a restoration of the common tort law so that citizens can stop anyone else from polluting their property.

Economically, we need to make progress by creating finished products instead of importing. We need to start our own enterprises instead of relying on foreign investors. We should stop selling our assets to subsidize a standard of living that cannot be sustained by what we produce. Welfare benefits, special grants and subsidies push us into decline. We should only help the really, truly needy people. The producers in our society are making all kinds of claims and the money from the producers is dwindling. Our children are going to have to pay for our present excesses.

People are being paid not to become Canadians. We are siding with all these multicultural groups, totally at variance with long-established Canadian values and practice. The government should stop using our tax money to expand and get social programs.

The Chair: Ms Butson, if you would sum up, please.

Ms Butson: Well, I wanted to put something about Quebec because I think that is very important. There are a couple of points that people raised.

The entrenchment of rights: We had all kinds of rights before we had the Charter of Rights; in fact, we had more, because under our Charter of Rights we only have the rights that are spelled out to us, whereas under British law, everybody was free and equal and had all kinds of rights unless they were specifically disallowed by some special law.

With regard to Quebec, okay, can it separate? Some people might ask, does a part of the country have a right to say just, "We are going to start another country"? If they do, then someone has to speak up for us and arrange this thing, and it is not Brian Mulroney, because he is too biased towards Quebec. Quebec, if there is a separation, should not have all of Quebec; it should have what was New France, because all northern Quebec, Rupert's Land and those areas were ceded to Canada, not Quebec, by the Hudson's Bay Co.

This also affects our environment. Ontario should speak out that northern Quebec should not be part of a new, independent Quebec because it should be prevented from flooding all northern Quebec for this big hydroelectric project.

Somebody talked about wiping the table clean and starting again. All I can say is, the powers that be do not seem to have any respect for Canada's Constitution or heritage. Canada's image was fascinating and compelling from the Elizabethan explorers to Canada's magnificent contribution in two world wars. Institutions have served our country well and could do even better, if given the chance, by wiping the table clean. You are going to have a heck of a job to put it all together again. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Butson.

RON VINE

The Chair: We are going to call next Ron Vine.

[Remarks in Ojibway]

Mr Vine: As I stand here before you tonight, I think first of the great privilege to meet before this distinguished committee, which in this year, regardless of this or any other tribunal in this province or any federal jurisdiction, the future of Canada will be greatly revised. As I have followed the proceedings here as in Quebec, we are hearing many points of view, some of which have not changed in the past two centuries.

Harriet Taylor once said: "It is indeed easier to discern the errors and blemishes of things than their good. It should be remembered by the critically minded that the habit of noting deficiencies before we observe beauties does really, for themselves, lessen the amount of the latter." How true this is, and how many more beauties we have in the Canadas than we have deficiencies. Yes, it is true that we have not yet reached the ideal stage which many of us would wish to have reached by now, but it is also true that we are unique, not only for the natural beauty which many of us have experienced from our travels from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but in the warmth, generosity and good spirit the Canadians show towards each other, to visitors from all walks of life and from all over the world.

In all of my travels throughout this great country, through all of the provinces, I have seen not only a love for each other and a great caring vision but also a great need

for a culture where each individual can find his or her maximum potential. This—in one, two or 10 Canadas—will not change. As a federalist, I would of course be saddened by a breakup of Confederation. As one who lived in and fought the first referendum in Quebec, I would be saddened to think that we have not moved an inch since that time towards alleviating the fears of French Canadians of the loss of language and culture, or alleviating the fears of others of a strong French Canada within Confederation. This is indeed sad.

I will tell you firsthand that Quebec is a marvellous and wonderful place with people unlike any I have ever met. I am grateful and humble by all I have learned about these people, their history and their culture.

J'ai accepté la réalité d'un Québec français et j'aime ce Québec. Il est le seul juste champ de l'Amérique qui parle français, de même que le portugais pour le Brésil et l'espagnol pour la plupart des pays d'Amérique. La constitution du Canada a besoin d'accepter cette vision.

The vision of a Canada is what I wish to use my remaining time today to talk to you about. The first part of this vision is an enhanced Charter of Rights and Freedoms that leaves no one unprotected. This is fundamental. Our Constitution should be strong, and should be upheld with the great and masterful words of those documents, the American Constitution, la charte des droits humains, the Magna Carta and the other great liberal doctrines of history which are sought to ameliorate the freedom of mankind.

We in Ontario should be proud of our Human Rights Code, which, like that of Quebec and many other provinces, guarantees certain rights and freedoms. I assure you that a strong preamble to the Constitution, followed by an enhanced Charter of Rights and Freedoms, may not get acceptance by all of the people, but it will by those who understand and truly cherish liberty. Let us no longer compromise on this. Let us develop a new charter and a new Constitution which accepts a vision for a country unlike any mankind has known, and if we fail, we fail knowing that we have tried what is right and just, and we shall have no shame. But to compromise rights and liberties behind closed doors and in an elitist framework would be shameful, for it is wrong, for it accepts the notion that we could be any other than our best.

Ontario can lead by example, by increasing those rights further for own citizens, by taking a leading role in negotiations with other governments in Canada, by not falling prey to anger, resentment or petty feuds of the minority. And Ontario should see that the next round of negotiations, perhaps our last, should have decision-makers from all backgrounds, not just a group of 11 men, all white or near, representing an abnormal skewing of our population and privilege. This time, have participation in the decision-making process from all groups, for we will not lose power by sharing and believing in ourselves, but instead we will be truly empowered.

But vision has another part to it, the part of dreams, and do not let the dreams die. When faced with polls showing anger and resentment towards each other, we must dream. We must constitutionally commit ourselves to promote and protect an understanding for an appreciation

of each other within our multicultural society and mosaic. We must dream of a time when all Canadians will feel this is their country and they control their own destinies. This will come about either within the dream of Confederation or by the breakup of it, but it will come about.

Voyez-vous ensemble ; pensez le Canada et la jeunesse.

When I started my speech tonight, I opened with greeting in Ojibway. The first nations have a philosophy which says that we have not inherited the land from our ancestors but we have borrowed it from our children. Let us dream together of a future Canada, as wonderful, as free and dynamic as that we have been fortunate enough to strive for. Let us try to build a new country based on only two principles, those of rights and freedom and those of dreams. Stand tall, walk proud Canada. You are beautiful. Thank you. Merci.

[Remarks in Ojibway]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Vine.

SUSAN WHYTE

The Chair: Could I call next Susan Whyte. Is Susan Whyte here?

Ms Whyte: Where do I go? I feel very nervous. Anyway, Gary knows how nervous I am feeling. My name is Susan Whyte. I live in St. Catharines. I have two daughters and both are deaf. I was born deaf. I was born into a family that is all hearing, and when I was growing up we did not use sign language. When I was going to school, I went to the Belleville school for the deaf. I am very nervous. When I finished school, I went home but I did not have the opportunity to be exposed to my own culture or my own language.

Can you imagine the other cultures that are in Canada and how they would suffer if people were not allowed to be exposed to them within their own family unit? You would see the disappearance of the cultures.

I would like to see American sign language recognized as an official language because it is an important part of our culture and it allows deaf people to reach their potential and does not limit them. Really, I would like to see ASL officially recognized because people who come from other countries are still able to partake in their own culture. They still learn another language but they have that opportunity. If we have that opportunity to use our own language, then we can enjoy our own culture and I feel that it is important to respect all cultures.

I think that is all I would like to say. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

FRED CLARKSON

The Chair: Could I call next Fred Clarkson.

Mr Clarkson: I guess I do not need to use the microphone. My name is Fred Clarkson and I come from Hamilton. I have grown up here. I attended the Belleville school for the deaf for about 11 years, and at that time sign language was not used so we had to try and obtain our education through lip-reading.

It was when I got out of school and started meeting other deaf people that I was able to communicate because

used American sign language, whereas in school it was limited to a visual form of English and lip-reading. But most of my education was from other deaf people who used the language and were members of the culture that I am a member of and used the language I used.

My children are not deaf, but they are fluent in ASL as well as the culture and I find that vital. That is all I wanted to say.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Clarkson.

10

JOSEPH CASSAR

The Chair: Could I call next Joseph Cassar.

Mr Cassar: Good evening, Mr Chairman and members of the committee. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my views about the problem facing Canada, which is true democracy. Unless we practise it faithfully and sincerely, we will never solve our problems.

My name is Joseph Cassar. I am of Maltese origin, but first and foremost I am a proud Canadian. I came to this wonderful country as an immigrant 43 years ago, in 1948, after the second great war. After a few months in Canada, one day the headlines of the front page of the daily newspaper read "Newfoundland to Secede from Great Britain and Join Canada." Joey Smallwood, Premier at that time, had foreseen the future greatness of this country called Canada. Unfortunately, nowadays we have some forces determined to break this great country.

I watch, listen and read the comments of the participants of this hearing, and so far I have not heard one comment of the fundamental issue, that is, how to run this country with unity and true democracy, where every person has the same opportunity, rights and benefits.

This country is composed of people of many different cultures, and it seems to me that we all want to be known as the country of origin, that is, German Canadian, French Canadian, English Canadian, Polish Canadian. The time has come to take a bold step towards one culture, Canadian, no matter where our ancestors came from and what role was played in the making of this country.

We have a country made up of 10 provincial governments, a federal government, thousands of city councils and regional governments. If we look at the history of elections we find that hardly ever has a government been elected by a majority of votes. A case in point was the last election in Ontario, where 37% of votes elected a majority government, which in my opinion is unfair. This is not true democracy. Do not get me wrong: I am an NDP, but what fair is fair.

Now let us look at the many conferences between the federal and provincial governments. When has any meeting ended up with full agreements? Never. Why? Because the Prime Minister and the premiers look after their own governments' interest. Therefore, we have here 11 different directions and never a straight line. What we should have is one true democratic country and one government. My idea—this will shock you—of running this country is as follows.

First, abolish all lieutenant governors. Second, abolish provincial governments. Third, abolish all city councils

and regional governments. Now let's start making this country.

First, divide each province into 10 regions, each region to be governed by 20 councillors and the chairman. Elect two councillors from each region.

Second, elect the federal Parliament consisting of 300 members, three members from each region, 30 from each province. This way, each province has the same number of members of Parliament no matter how large or small; they have the same voice.

Third, forming of the federal cabinet: Besides the normal department, create a minister and deputy minister for each province, the deputy minister to reside in the province he represents.

Fourth, elect a senator from each region, 100 in all. All senators would be elected as independents. A Senate is important as a watchdog of the government not to exceed its mandate.

In my opinion, this is the fairest and most effective way to run the country. I call to all politicians to put aside their personal ambitions and to work to make this country the greatest, where every person has the same rights, privileges and benefits, no matter what creed or colour and no matter in what part of the country they reside.

On 4 July 1968, William Gold of the Hamilton Spectator wrote:

"Election Justice and Myth.

"Is Canada a true democracy? No. Does parliamentary membership reflect the people's wishes? No. Does one man, one vote work here? No. The propositions have not been true for 100 years. Last week's election redemonstrated their invalidity beyond question. In the cold light of electoral tidiness the Trudeau government is a grotesque distortion of voter preference. So far, Canada has accepted the distortion in the belief that it at least produces a stable government, but on the heels of an election fought on grounds of national unity that argument sounds hollow. The fact is that our voting system favours sectional differences and works against national consensus."

Then he gave a few examples. I will quote one.

"In 1966 Quebec Liberals won 47% of the vote and 51 seats in the election. The Union National won only 41% of the votes, but elected 55 seats, and Daniel Johnson is still Premier today in outright travesty of election justice."

Mr Chairman, what this hearing is trying to do is rearrange the furniture in the house that is built on a shaky foundation and is about to be destroyed. Let us first rebuild a solid foundation and then rearrange the furniture.

Thank you, Mr Chairman and members for your attention.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr Winninger: On a point of clarification, Mr Chairman—

The Chair: No, we are going to carry on, Mr Winninger. Nice try, though.

Mr Winninger: I just wondered if there would be a grandfather clause, so that some of us elected people could serve out our terms before you abolish us.

Ms Churley: What about a grandmother clause?

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Cassar.

RONALD BAYNE

The Chair: Ronald Bayne.

Mr Bayne: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. I will try to keep myself within the five minutes.

When so much has been said already, one is hesitant to contribute more verbiage, yet our country seems on the brink of breaking up, and if that matters, now is the time to speak.

So much negative opinion has been expressed in the media by people who apparently are frustrated and angry that one despairs of reversing a slide into greater divisiveness, divisiveness that will relieve the anger only because it will end in isolation and silence.

I have no knowledge or experience in politics or economics. I am a physician. My thought in being here is to bring forward some basic questions that I feel should come before discussing politics and economics. For me, the political structure and the economic arrangements are ways of achieving what we want to do. The first question therefore is: What do we want?

Note that this question is extremely challenging. In how many countries in the world is it possible for the citizens to ask this fundamental question? It is only possible in a free society, but also a society that is afraid to ask the question. Note also that the question has to be followed by a rational corollary: What is possible?

So let me speak to these two questions. What we want cannot be answered by a referendum. The question is too complex. What we want depends on shared vision, perspective, aspirations, opportunities and benefits, and what it would cost us in terms of conciliation, compromise, and economic sacrifices. The question requires consensus if the country is to hold together, but such a consensus is not something to be achieved at some point in time and then survives. It must continually change and evolve as a people and their nation evolve. This process, then, depends on a dynamic relationship, with dialogue, dispute, discussion and acceptance of differences.

I was born in Sherbrooke, Quebec, a city that was mainly anglophone when I was born there and has become mainly francophone since then. We were required to learn French from grade 2. We were required to study French, but we resisted learning it. We were in the anglophone community, we felt threatened by the growing francophone population, yet we despised them because of their different values. It was only when I graduated in medicine from McGill that it struck me that I was forcing patients, sick people, mothers with sick children, to struggle to express their concerns in, for them, an unfamiliar tongue.

Même si j'ai appris depuis à parler assez couramment, on peut voir que mon accent est mauvais et que je fais plusieurs erreurs.

2120

But I will continue in English. I have acquired a respect for the language and, more important, for the different and perfectly valid values of the French Canadian population. Tolerance and respect for other cultures is important in civilized society, and not only the French Canadian

culture. Its importance for the individual is that it allow for growth of understanding of other cultures and value and self-development. We should be glad to have cultural diversity.

Since moving to Ontario, I have witnessed the increasing acrimony between anglophones and francophones in Canada. I have tried to think of a model for this relationship and I believe it useful to compare it to a marriage on the point of divorce. Marriages between people are of all sorts and the analogy should not be carried too far. But it is not true that people enter on marriage with hopes and aspirations and the belief that together they can create something greater than themselves, a relationship in which each will grow in understanding and maturity, and a relationship that will be a support in adversity, and a relationship that will be creative and contribute to society?

It is not easy to achieve, and many marriages are not dissolving. The key factor that may initiate disillusion when the hopes and aspirations begin to fail. Then one hears statements about the rights of the individuals, the unacceptable differences between them, and the cry of "What does she want? What does she expect?" Have you not heard the same remarks expressed about Quebec, remarks such as: "Why should Quebec be different? What about our rights? What does Quebec want?" And, now the separation seems likely: "Well, let her go. I can do without her."

The argument may be made that this analogy is inappropriate, because the relationship between cultural or language groups must be rationally based on charters, rights, economics and political process. I believe Canada was not created through logical thought. It is geographically, economically and militarily incongruous, quite ridiculous as a nation in the traditional sense. It is only comprehensible as a social and political entity because its people have been united in their hopes and aspirations, in their values and principles. If we do not hold these values and principles any longer, then of course we will dissolve and vanish.

The question that should be asked of those who say "Let Quebec go," is: What will this contribute to Canada? How will separation enhance or reinforce our values and principles? The fact that Canadians constantly bicker, question our identity, question our role in the world, is in a perverse way a sign of the strength of our conviction. Like a successfully married couple, we should be able to argue about the really important things without fear of violence and with the intent of finding a useful resolution.

This is what has established Canada's reputation in the world and in the United Nations. We are not feared of others, because we are militarily inconsequential but because we do not insist we have the answers for the world's problems. All we can do is help others by example to openly discuss and resolve their differences.

To summarize this part of my presentation, Canada including, I hope, people of Quebec, must ask ourselves: What do we want Canada to be? The possibility is there to be internally discordant but tolerant, self-deprecating but respected in the world, multiculturally divided but united in a deeper understanding of human needs.

As to the question, "What is possible?" one could say anything, provided that one is prepared to bear the cost. In terms of economics we have the disadvantage of being a small economy in a small market much influenced by the United States. To maintain a degree of independence probably has a price in terms of a lower standard of living and higher commodity costs.

Geographically it is difficult to communicate and maintain a sense of identity. No national features, except the Great Lakes, separate us from the rest of North America. There is a cost to maintaining links by road, rail, air and telecommunications. Militarily we have a cost advantage, because this country is too vast for us to defend effectively. We only need to maintain a police force and an army sufficient for a people that live harmoniously together—

The Chair: If you could sum up, Mr Bayne.

Mr Bayne: —and we have no desire to conquer anyone. Why should we continue even if this is possible?

May I just continue? Here I can only reiterate that Canada has stood for peace, freedom, non-aggression and tolerance, and has played an important role on the world stage. Is this something we should continue to aspire to? If you will ask, "These are fine sentiments, but how can you make them realistic and practical?" My answer is twofold.

First, Canadians need to be given or to reiterate a vision for Canada. We have heard something about that already. Leadership is necessary and can only come from persons of integrity who are respected because they exemplify the standards and principles Canadians value.

Second, Canadians need to assure each other that they want to be together. To help each other grow in understanding and tolerance, Canadians must be willing to ask themselves, first of all, not "What are my rights?" but "What are my responsibilities? How can I contribute to making this country a good place to live, an example to the world?" Thank you.

ASSOCIATION DES ENSEIGNANTES ET DES ENSEIGNANTS FRANCO-ONTARIENS

The Chair: Marielle Arnold.

Mme Arnold : Il me fait plaisir, au nom de l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens l'unité régionale de Hamilton-Wentworth, élémentaire séparée catholique, de remercier sincèrement le gouvernement de l'Ontario, et plus particulièrement le comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, qui permet aux citoyennes et aux citoyens de notre province de prononcer sur l'avenir de leur pays.

Nous jugeons primordial le rôle de notre association dans le processus démocratique de redéfinition de l'institution canadienne. Voici pourquoi nous tenons à vous présenter notre vision de ce nouveau Canada avec nos idées, nos préoccupations et certaines suggestions qui, nous osons l'espérer, s'avéreront des éléments essentiels pour aider à bâtir un Canada fort et unique en son genre.

L'AAEFO regroupe quelque 6200 membres qui oeuvrent en province. Notre unité régionale élémentaire séparée catholique comprend 54 membres qui oeuvrent dans les deux

écoles de langue française de la ville de Hamilton, soit l'école Monseigneur-de-Laval et l'école Notre-Dame.

Parmi les buts de notre association, il y a en deux qui résument et qui identifient clairement notre mandat. Permettez-moi de les énoncer. Tout d'abord, nous voulons protéger individuellement et collectivement nos membres pour assurer le respect de tous leurs droits. En deuxième lieu, nous désirons promouvoir une meilleure éducation des francophones en Ontario. Le mandat est clair et précis mais les nombreux enjeux politiques et économiques nuisent souvent à sa mise en oeuvre.

Notre pays est rendu à une étape déterminante face à son avenir. Nul n'est indifférent aux problèmes des dernières décennies. En plus de l'échec du Lac Meech, de la crise des autochtones, de l'aliénation de l'Ouest et du mouvement indépendantiste au Québec, il y a le danger constant de perdre notre identité franco-ontarienne face à l'omniprésence américaine.

Cette période de crise remet donc en question plus que jamais l'unité du pays. Plusieurs de ces problèmes touchent à un point névralgique, celui de la reconnaissance et du respect des droits des francophones. Pourtant, nous les enseignantes et les enseignants croyons fermement que l'Ontario est la province idéale, celle qui peut jouer un rôle de premier plan dans la réalisation du projet Canada. Comment pouvons-nous en arriver à une telle conclusion? Notre province est riche et prospère grâce à ses richesses naturelles et à ses ressources humaines. Elle doit donc donner le ton à l'évolution rapide de la société canadienne.

À cause de la présence du demi-million de francophones, de la majorité anglophone, de la communauté autochtone et des nombreux groupes ethniques qui viennent nous enrichir de leur culture, leur langue, leur religion et leur vision du monde, l'Ontario possède tous les éléments essentiels à la réussite de l'unité nationale. Il s'agit de trouver la formule juste et équitable, celle qui va reconnaître et respecter toutes les citoyennes et tous les citoyens sans exception.

Pourtant, la réalité n'en est pas ainsi. Plusieurs francophones se sentent souvent aliénés dans leur propre province. Même si notre constitution reconnaît le français et l'anglais comme langues officielles, les francophones doivent constamment revendiquer leurs droits au niveau fédéral. En province, il y a eu une amélioration, pour ne pas dire une évolution, depuis le Règlement 17 qui interdisait l'enseignement du français dans les écoles de l'Ontario.

Avec l'avènement de la Loi 8, certains et certaines, et je répète certains et certaines francophones peuvent être desservis dans leur langue maternelle. La communauté se voit dorénavant divisée : ceux et celles qui ont le droit de recevoir les services en français, et les autres, qui malheureusement ne vivent pas dans une des régions désignées. En tant que regroupement francophone qui a le mandat de promouvoir une meilleure éducation pour les siens, nous percevons ce défi comme étant énorme mais encore possible à relever.

À ce moment-ci, abordons le dossier de l'éducation en précisant quelques points. Les Franco-Ontariennes et les Franco-Ontariens sont assez bien desservis en ce qui concerne les écoles primaires et secondaires. Hélas, les

services s'arrêtent trop souvent à ces deux paliers. L'éducation postsecondaire est presque inexistante pour un ou une francophone qui veut poursuivre ses études en français. Il existe la Cité collégiale, qui a ouvert ses portes à Ottawa depuis quelques années mais c'est minime et largement insuffisant.

2130

L'Ontario doit créer un réseau collégial et universitaire pour répondre aux besoins des francophones. Les universités bilingues sont trop souvent des milieux d'assimilation. Notre association a présenté en juin 1990 un mémoire à la Commission sur les services collégiaux en français dans le centre et le sud-ouest de l'Ontario. Il s'agit de s'y référer pour se rendre compte que le besoin est pressant.

L'AEFO croit que la création de conseils scolaires homogènes de langue française à l'échelle provinciale est nécessaire. Ainsi, les Franco-Ontariennes et les Franco-Ontariens auraient la responsabilité de s'autogérer et de répondre à leurs besoins spécifiques. L'apprentissage commencerait dès le début dans la langue maternelle et le processus continuerait logiquement, pour ainsi dire. Le but ultime est de passer des paliers élémentaire, secondaire et postsecondaire pour en arriver au marché du travail. C'est l'essence même du système éducatif, de permettre à nos jeunes de se diriger avec assurance vers un avenir prometteur et prospère.

Voici ce que nous suggérons au gouvernement de l'Ontario pour amener les francophones à se sentir citoyennes et citoyens à part entière : déclarer que les communautés francophone, anglophone et autochtones ont égalité de statut en Ontario ; déclarer l'Ontario bilingue ; faire la promotion de la dualité linguistique dans la province ; mettre sur pied des institutions postsecondaires francophones et/ou créer un conseil scolaire homogène de langue française au niveau de la province. Il ne faut aucunement négliger les services juridiques, sociaux et communautaires, ceux de la santé et les services municipaux qui pourront émerger après une reconnaissance officielle en bonne et dû forme de nos droits linguistiques.

À ce moment critique de l'histoire du Canada, le peuple ontarien et son gouvernement se doivent de prendre un rôle de leadership et de définir clairement les besoins et les intérêts de tous et de toutes. Il doit y avoir une volonté commune, celle de rester ensemble et de s'engager à faire sa juste part dans la concrétisation du projet Canada. C'est pour cette raison que notre association a cru bon de vous faire part de nos préoccupations en ce qui a trait à l'éducation en province, et aussi vous suggérer cinq moyens d'y parvenir.

HELEN PROBERT

The Chair: Our final speaker this evening is Helen Probert.

Ms Probert: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I speak for myself and my friends and my family. I have worked with native people since 1967. I do not presume to speak for them but I know many of their problems. I believe that, in spite of Oka and the publicity they have had lately, very

few people know the conditions, especially in the northern areas, that native people live under. However this turnout, something should be done across the provinces to adjust to this problem.

I love Canada, all of it. I love it from Atlantic to Pacific to Arctic. I am a Canadian first and an Ontarian second. I do not understand why so many people are something else first and Canadian second. Maybe that is our problem, part of it. Canada is enriched by the Quebec culture. We are enriched by the native culture, the English culture and all of the cultures that have been added since from all of the various places in the world. Instead of narrowing down to English only, French only, etc, we should rejoice in variety. More voices should be raised to this effort and to keep emphasizing that this is a very positive thing in our life. The distinctiveness of the French fact in Quebec is a fact, and I do not know why there is such an issue being made of it. Also, natives peoples, the first founding nation are a distinctive people, and I do not see why we cannot admit that without this fractionization of the country.

I believe in a strong central government with flexibility to arrange equivalent but maybe slightly varied adjustments between areas. They do not all have to be exactly the same. They should balance out. I believe in a Charter of Rights. I believe in no trade or job barriers between provinces. Some things should be under the central government such as trade, monetary policy and the environment—especially the environment—health and defence.

I think there should be a Senate, a body of sober second thought, but not a body for party games. I have not made up my mind whether it should be elected or appointed in some fashion, but there should be a balance across the country. The way the various governments, especially the federal government, mismanaged Meech and the way the press reported the various happenings and the way Quebec misread Meech's rejection have tragically resulted in our drifting apart, stumbling towards breakup.

I am appalled at the dearth of strong voices speaking out for Canada. Most of the things you hear in the press are that such and such is wrong, something else is wrong, somebody else is finding this fault and somebody else is finding that fault. I think what we need are strong leaders in Quebec and across Canada and in the press, presenting the positive values and possibilities for Canada as a whole entity, rather than a broken-up and fractured group of separate countries. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, madam. On this note we conclude our hearings here in Hamilton. We want to thank all of the speakers here this evening and this afternoon. This also concludes for us the third week of hearings, and it has been a fascinating process for us so far. No doubt the remaining week, which has us beginning in Ottawa on Monday, will be equally challenging for us. I want to thank again people that came and invite people to continue to follow our proceedings over the parliamentary network. As I say, we begin again on Monday. Thank you very much. Good evening.

The committee adjourned at 2136.

CONTENTS

Thursday 21 February 1991

John Johnson	C-627
Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques romaines du district de Haldimand-Norfolk	C-629
Ter Leibovitch	C-631
United Nations Council	C-634
Uline Johnson Collegiate	C-637
Norman Serro	C-639
Social Planning and Research Council of St Catharines and Thorold	C-639
Norman Walpole	C-641
Edy Wiseblatt	C-643
Anna Bedard	C-644
Afternoon sitting	C-646
Deila Copps	C-646
Monarchist League of Canada	C-649
Tom Christoff	C-652
George Sorger	C-654
United Disabled Consumers	C-656
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario	C-658
Sociation des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens	C-660
Trinton Secondary School	C-661
École secondaire Georges-P-Vanier	C-663
Anthony Bratschisch	C-666
Tom Shore	C-667
Nenica Djukic	C-669
Evening sitting	C-671
Conseil des directeurs et des directrices des écoles franco-ontariennes du Centre-sud de l'Ontario	C-671
Chris Cutler	C-674
South Centres d'alphabétisation du sud de l'Ontario	C-675
Norman March	C-677
Business Council for Fair Trade	C-678
Chinese Canadian Society of Hamilton-Wentworth-Halton	C-681
Deen Butson	C-682
Tom Vine	C-683
Sam Whyte	C-684
David Clarkson	C-684
Joseph Cassar	C-685
Nald Bayne	C-686
Sociation des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens	C-687
Len Probert	C-688
Journalism	C-688

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)

Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

Arnott, Ted (Wellington PC) for Mr Harnick

MacKinnon, Ellen (Lambton NDP) for Ms Harrington

Witmer, Elizabeth (Waterloo North PC) for Mr Eves

Ward, Brad (Brantford NDP) for Mr F. Wilson

Also taking part:

Abel, Donald (Wentworth North NDP)

Haeck, Christel (Ms)(St. Catharines-Brock NDP)

Morrow, Mark (Wentworth East NDP)

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis

Staff: Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office







**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 35th Parliament

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Monday 25 February 1991

**Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation**

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 35^e législature

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Le lundi 25 février 1991

**Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération**

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Monday 25 February 1991

The committee met at 1016 in the council chambers, regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, Ottawa, Ontario.

The Chair: If I can call the meeting to order, first of all, good morning. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. On behalf of the committee I would like to welcome all of those people who are here with us this morning in Ottawa at the council chambers of the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. We are pleased to be here as a committee, continuing our meetings and hearings across the province in Ontario in Confederation.

We have heard in the three weeks of hearings to date a number of useful and interesting suggestions to us about many issues that we need to be conscious of and no doubt we will hear equally as many useful and interesting suggestions here in Ottawa today, and in the rest of the week at the various other locations we will be visiting.

This is our last week of hearings in our swing across the eastern part of the province and before calling on the first speaker, I would like to introduce the members of the committee. This is of course an all-party committee of the Legislature of Ontario and we have representatives from the three political parties that are represented at Queen's Park. From the NDP caucus, in addition to myself, we have Gilles Bisson, the Vice-Chair of the committee, who will be joining us shortly; Marilyn Churley; David Wittinger; Fred Wilson; Gary Wilson, and Gary Malkowski. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Bloor, Yvonne O'Neill, Steven Offer. From the Conservative caucus we have Charles Harnick, and also joining us today are two of the Liberal members from the Ottawa area, Dalton McGuinty and Bob Chiarelli. Welcome.

I know that people have been told this, but because of the number of groups and individuals who want to speak to us, what we have done is set up the schedule so that we will be hearing from representatives of organizations this morning and this afternoon, and then in the evening session we will be hearing primarily from individuals. We have also had to trim the times to about 15 minutes per organization for this morning and this afternoon, as a way to try to get through as many people as we could. We also would like to try within that time to see if there can be some time to have some questions from the members of the committee.

The surrounding is quite beautiful here in the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. It obviously is set up for a much larger body than we are, so there seems to be a bit of distance between us and the audience and we are sorry about that, but we will continue and do our best to overcome the sort of physical space.

JACK PICKERSGILL

The Chair: Could I start then by calling on Jack Pickersgill to come forward. Mr Pickersgill of course is a former MP and former cabinet minister. We are pleased that you could be with us this morning, Mr Pickersgill.

Hon Mr Pickersgill: Mr Chairman, honourable members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and other ladies and gentlemen present, I feel that I have a kind of non-partisan approach to the Ontario Legislature. I was born in June 1905, six months after the Tory party won an election for the first time in the history of Ontario. Before I was born, my political career began. I was named by my father who said to my mother, six months before I was born, "We are going to call that boy Whitney for the Tory Premier." I have known the Peterson family for a long time and David Peterson is a close friend. I have known the present Premier since his birth, so I think you can say that I have a rather broad perspective here.

At the same time I am sure that the rest of you, like me, find it rather hard to concentrate on Canadian problems when there is fierce warfare going on in which our country is involved, but I am going to try to concentrate on this fortunate country of ours. I think it is a good time for us to reflect that 105 years ago the last shot was fired in combat in Canada.

In the 230 years that French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians—including my mother's ancestors, all of them—have lived side by side in the lake country and the valley of the St Lawrence there has been only one attempt in that 230 years to change our system by armed force. That was a century and a half ago and it was a rather pitiful affair at that.

We Canadians, either as colonials or as a nation—perhaps I should say "country" and avoid the word "nation" because everybody has his own interpretation of it and some of them are rather silly. As a country, we seem to have a strong preference for ballots over bullets, and I am sure it will continue. We have a preference for honourable compromise over hostile confrontation. I commend that, not merely to this committee but to all Canadians everywhere.

Now we read in the press, we hear on the streets and above all hear on the other media, the broadcasters, how this country is in the greatest crisis in its history. For me, that indicates one thing. Most of these voices who are saying Canada has no tomorrow seem to be people who do not realize that we had a yesterday, and that that yesterday goes beyond two centuries.

I made an honest living teaching history in college and the University of Manitoba for eight years before I became a bureaucrat and later a politician here in Ottawa. It is mainly as a historian that I am going to speak to you today, because I do not think that particularly people who are

trusted by their fellow citizens to deal with the problems of our country can ever know too much about the past of the country or about its geography.

I think many of these people who are talking about the greatest crisis in our history are the kind of people who tend to speak before they think. I have a strong preference for thinking before one speaks and often not speaking at all.

Let me go back to my own earliest memories of public affairs. I remember at our dining table on a homestead in the bush in Manitoba, 100 miles north of Winnipeg, when we got the newspaper, which was not the day it happened, and my father read about the murder of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand on 28 June 1914, which was of course the beginning of the First World War, my father, who had never gone to high school but who had a tremendous interest in public affairs all his life, and it was not a very long life, turned to my mother and said, "There's going to be a war."

I do not think there were many farmers in Canada who paid much attention to that incident at that time, but it produced a real crisis in Canada, that war, and it left a deep division on racial lines over the question of conscription. It also produced a government in 1917 which was called the union government. It was a coalition of Tories and most of the English-speaking Liberals in Parliament. It did not have one French Canadian minister and there was not one French Canadian supporter of the government. That was what was called the union government. Well, we have never repeated that kind of union, I am happy to say. It was the only one in our history and we are never going to do it again, I am confident.

That was not the only crisis. Indeed, the history of Canada is the history of what everybody is pleased to call crises. After the war, in 1919, we had a revolt of the farmers. It was called the Progressive Party or the United Farmers of Ontario and it ended for ever the two-party system, in federal Canada at least.

Never since 1921 have there been only two parties in the House of Commons except that disastrous year—I hope the Conservative representative here will not think I am wrong in saying that—1958, when there 208, I think it was, Conservatives on one side of the House and 49 Liberals on the other, but even then there were eight members of the CCF, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, so that there has never been a Parliament since 1921 which has had a straight two-party system, though we still talk about it as though that is the way our institution is operated.

A lot of people thought these farmers were going to devastate urban Canada. Well, they did not. They did contribute to giving us Prohibition for a while, but even that did not last.

1030

Then of course we had a terrible social crisis, if you want to call it a crisis, a terrible period in the history of Canada, from 1930 to 1935 or 1936 or even 1937, when a few Canadians actually died because they did not have enough to live on; not many, because even then there was a lot of compassion, but there was not much welfare and what there was was a miserable pittance. No Canadian province at that time got quite as far down as Newfoundland did, where the welfare was six cents a day, but it was

not very much better in other parts of Canada. It is still memory for older people like me of one of those things that divided the country deeply and that we have been trying never to have recur, and it has not recurred.

Then we had the Second World War and there again we had nothing like as deep a division as there was in 1917 but we had a deep division, again over the question of conscription. Fortunately it did not provoke the same kind of ill feeling that the first one did.

Then the next great disturbance was what is called the Quiet Revolution. Luckily it was a quiet revolution. It was another case where we Canadians preferred ballots to bullets but in the rest of the country there were a great many people who thought the Quiet Revolution was the first stage in splitting up Canada. Well, it was not. It certainly did change the whole complexion of one province and began to change the complexion of Canadians, even in British Columbia and Alberta which are not very favourable to change.

Then we had the Parti québécois government in Quebec and that looked like the beginning of the end to a lot of Canadians. I remember a very wise friend of mine, a woman diplomat, saying to me about three months before the PQ won the election of 1976, "You know, I think the sooner we get these people in office so they see what the problems are, the better for the country." I do not say it was an unmixed blessing to the country—do not misunderstand me—but I say that it did, as subsequent events have proved, show that it was not easy to split this country up. What happened, of course, was that that government did some good things and some silly things, but it did not doom Canada.

Then, of course, we had what I think is one of the saddest things. We took control for the first time of our own Constitution here in Canada and we did it and changed the Constitution of the province of Quebec in defiance of an almost unanimous vote of the Quebec Legislature. I was in favour of patriation, but I felt it was a terrible thing. I think I would have had to vote for it, because I thought we could never have self-respect until we ran our own affairs in every respect, but I certainly did not approve of changing the Constitution of a province without its consent. That really was a deep wound. The federalist party, which was the Liberal Party, voted against it in the Legislature of Quebec just as much as the PQ did. It is at the root of the problem you people are considering today.

We hear a lot of talk about how Quebec is always wanting concessions. The fact is that the present Premier of Quebec came to Meech Lake after meeting with all the other premiers in Edmonton and he made a tremendous concession to the rest of Canada in the most moderate reasonable proposals that could have been imagined. It is greatly to the credit of the rest of Canada that all the premiers, all but two of the legislatures and all three political leaders in the Parliament of Canada all realized what a healing thing this would be and they all agree with it and accepted it. Unfortunately, two provinces, where they had premiers who had not taken part in the original Meech Lake arrangements, frustrated this healing process.

It is still there and has to be healed, Meech Lake and its consequences, plus one other thing; plus the very, in my opinion, ill-advised and insulting provision in Bill 178 that Quebec that people could not put up signs on their own property in the English language. The predominance of French I think most Canadians consider reasonable, but to say that you cannot use your language—they do not say you cannot use it with your voice, but you cannot write it down, or at least you are supposed not to; fortunately they do not seem to enforce the law very well, and I trust it will not be too long before it disappears in another compromise.

140

I remember my younger son saying to me one time when he was in first or second year at university, "We Canadians have these disputes and we go to the brink but then we back off." That has happened, I think, in all these occasions I have referred to, and it will happen again. If wise people like you take a broad view and remember that you were elected primarily to look after the affairs of this province—this province is the richest, the best educated and, one hopes, the most broad-minded part of Canada. I think it depends more on Ontario than it does on any other part of this country to solve this problem today, because it is in this part of Canada that Canada really began.

I know there are a lot of people, including some people like you, Mr Chairman—I do not say you share this view, but a great many people who were latecomers to Canada like my father's family. My grandfather was born in England and he did not come to Canada until 1841 when he was six years old, so you can see that I am a descendant on the side of immigrants from across the Atlantic. But on the other side, every one of my mother's ancestors was in North America before 1800 and all but one family took part in what my grandmother called "the war," and the war was the American Revolution.

In 1763, after 100 years of conflict in North America, it ended in this part of North America, in what is now Canada, with a British victory. Twenty years later, the American colonies, helped by the French, defeated the British, and my ancestors came across the Niagara River, across the Detroit River, into what was the province of Quebec at that time, so you could say that in this part of the world, in what were called Upper and Lower Canada after they were divided in 1791, we were losers. The French were losers in 1763 and the English were losers in 1783. So we are a country of losers. As the refugees show in recent times, a awful lot of the immigrants to Canada were losers too, and that is why they came here. I think we ought to think about that a little, about these losers and what we have accomplished as losers.

But the main point I want to make is that the original Canada was a partnership, maybe an uneasy one, of British and French, and these others who object to that are not paying attention to history. After the rebellions in 1837 the British government paid attention to a report from Lord Durham, who said that the rebellion in Lower Canada was two nations warring in the bosom of a state. Well, that was a completely false interpretation of what happened. There was a rebellion in Upper Canada as well, and it is an extraordinary thing that the reformers in Upper Canada

were in alliance with the reformers in Lower Canada, and the reformers in Lower Canada were by no means all French speaking.

But the British government's idea of solving this problem is the same kind of idea as you sometimes get in letters to the newspapers and sometimes get in misguided places like the city council of Thunder Bay and Sault Ste Marie, that you should extinguish one of the languages, and that is what the Act of Union did. It united the two provinces of Canada into the province of Canada in which English was the only official language, and the French were supposed to fade away. Well, they did not exactly fade away, as we know, and they are not fading away now either, and they are not going to.

But what happened—and this is one of the proudest things, I think, in the whole of our Canadian history—was that the Parliament of the province of Canada, with an English-speaking majority, restored French as an official language. We do not celebrate that nearly enough. Most Canadians, I do not think, even know about it.

What is more, the leaders of the reform party in the two former provinces in the province of Canada gained what is the most important of all the elements of our Constitution, responsible government. You cannot find it written out in any Constitution, but it is far more important than anything in the Constitution because it is the very foundation of government. Nobody knows better than members of the Legislature of Ontario that responsible government enables voters to kick out a government not by force but by ballot when they do not like it any more, or even sometimes when they have no particular objection to it but think somebody else would be better. But it is this whole—

1050

The Chair: Mr Pickersgill, I really am sorry to have to interrupt you, but if you could sum up. We are a bit pressed for time, and we have gone beyond—

Hon Mr Pickersgill: I see. Well, I could perhaps sum up by giving you an idea, as I see it, of how Canada looks today, not to us but to the rest of the world. In the last 45 years we have had peace, our population has doubled, we have the second highest standard of living in the world and there are few countries anywhere in the world with less poverty than we have in Canada. There are hordes—read your Globe today—at our gates waiting to come in, and hordes who have got in waiting to be allowed to stay.

Observers worldwide ask why these lucky people—that is us—why we Canadians think we have a crisis. Well, we have, but it is not a great crisis. I think at the brink of our present constitutional and other difficulties we will find a compromise. It will take time and wisdom, not counting noses, and I think Ontario has the heaviest responsibility to find ways to heal the deep wounds of francophone Quebec, to relieve the restiveness—and it is quite serious—of the west and to reduce the isolation and relative poverty of Atlantic Canada. How can Ontario save Canada? That is your task, not mine at 85, though I have a few ideas. If I had not taken so much time, Mr Chairman, I would have been willing to answer questions.

The Chair: Well, we could probably allow one question.

Mr Beer: Thank you, Mr Pickersgill, for giving us that review of our history and a sense of perspective. I think that often we forget about our history, and, as you say, it is awfully hard to understand our present and where we are likely to go if we do not really understand what has happened in the past. I think you have reminded us of a number of periods in our history and particularly that period of the union of the two Canadas when English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians acted in a way that sought to bring people together.

I am wondering if you might comment on one issue that has come before this committee and indeed has been before the country, that people say we need to make some basic changes to our institutions, whether we are talking about the need for referendums and that we should have referendums on constitutional change, major changes to institutions like the Senate. Do you believe that in order for us to come out of the present problems we are going to have to in part address those problems by making some major changes to our political institutions and our political processes?

Hon Mr Pickersgill: On the question of a referendum, which I referred to perhaps disparagingly as a counting of noses, I think all the referendum will do is divide whatever area in which it is held. It cannot settle anything. There is no legal way. You can settle a provincial problem within provincial jurisdiction by a referendum if you want to, but the legislature of Quebec could not legally enact a provision for a referendum which would split up Canada. It is not within their power. All it would do is create further division. Neither could the Parliament of Canada have a referendum which would have any legal force if it interfered with provincial rights.

We divided jurisdiction at Confederation, and it is divided still. The Parliament of Canada cannot make laws within the provincial sphere and the legislatures cannot within a federal sphere, so there is no legal way, either by referendum or by the enactment of either parliament, federal or provincial, of bringing about a separation. That is why I think it is going to be so much more difficult to divide the country than to improve it that we should concentrate on improving it.

In *Le Devoir* of this morning, there is an item on the Premier of Quebec which every one of you should read, because it is the real key. The Allaire report did not say there should be a referendum on sovereignty. What it said was that there should be a referendum on a new deal between Canada and the provinces, particularly Quebec, of course, because it was writing about Quebec, but it did not exclude the other provinces, if you read it carefully. It is a very federalist document. But Mr Bourassa said the other day that it was not the Bible. All it is is a negotiating position. It is very important to realize that Quebec is no more monolithic than the rest of Canada. We need to look at it that way and support the people who want to keep Canada going, not those who want to break it up. I am taking too much of your time.

The Chair: That is fine. Thank you very much, Mr Pickersgill, for your perspectives on this issue. Thank you.

STUDENTS' FORUM ON CANADIAN UNITY

The Chair: Could I call next the Students' Forum on Canadian Unity: Paul Huston, Stuart Hoegner, Wendy Paynter, Brad LeDrew and Christine Fontaine.

Mr Huston: Ladies and gentlemen, members of the select committee and citizens of Ontario, my name is Paul Huston. We are the Students' Forum on Canadian Unity. Sitting to my left is Christine Fontaine. In the background are Stuart Hoegner and Wendy Paynter. Brad LeDrew unfortunately could not be with us this morning.

The Students' Forum on Canadian Unity began as a group of 12 University of Ottawa and Carleton University students united pretty much only by a common concern for the country we have today and the direction the current constitutional crisis is taking us. We represent various regions of the country, a variety of political values and various visions on what kind of Canada we would like to see.

1100

Since the initial days of founding, we have become a very close-knit group. At this moment, even as we speak, we have two delegations crossing the country, one travelling across the western provinces and one travelling across the Atlantic provinces, visiting schools and talking with students of all ages. In the future, we are also planning extensive tours of Ontario and Quebec.

Regarding the reason we were originally formed, there are two primary focus reasons we created this group.

First, we wanted to hear the views of students on various issues that were on their minds and, second, upon gathering these views, we wanted to communicate them to government and to the public at large. Elaborating on collecting their views, with the exception of focused issues relating to academics, such as tuition fees and the like, students have never really had a direct voice in the direction their nation is taking. This I and other members find shocking, considering that this is the nation we are going to be inheriting. Students lack a coherent voice in these discussions, and thus we formed the students' forum in order to act as a vehicle to relay these youth views.

Second, upon gathering these views, we are writing a comprehensive final report which we will be making public which will relay the ideas students have and the concerns they have about this country.

Regarding exactly what we are doing, we are sitting down with a variety of sizes of student groups, various ages, various academic backgrounds, and encouraging discussion and dialogue on the various crucial Canadian issues we face. So far, we have heard from students on a variety of issues, like regional isolation, native affairs, Quebec, bilingualism, multiculturalism and the women's issues.

We are going to the raw source of information in order to get this primary data, an unedited input. We are creating an environment that is far less intimidating to students than any sort of commission or forum could create. After all, we are their peers. We are also allowing students to educate themselves, allowing their various regional and cultural differences and backgrounds to be a source of this education.

Ms Fontaine: What we have found to date in our initial study is that students are extremely interested in the current national and regional issues. The students are aware of the issues and are eager to contribute their views to all of Canada. To date, there has not been a group that has taken the initiative and made a concerted effort to speak to the youth and hear the ideas and the concerns. We would like to make that voice heard.

As we have stated, students feel very passionately about the issues facing Canadians today. It is important that students have a voice and not be overlooked, as they are very insightful and are able to bring a wealth of information into the discussion that is currently facing all Canadians today.

We must also recognize that each generation has different ideas and different visions. The views of the younger generation must be thoroughly explored; hence the reason for our existence.

On behalf of the students' forum, we would like to thank you for your attention.

Mr Huston: Are there any questions some of the members have?

The Chair: I am sure there are. Let me say to you first of all that as a group we have been very interested in our findings to date to hear the views of young people, students and other young people. We found, as you said, that they in fact have some of the most insightful observations to make on this issue. I am sure other members will have more specific questions.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you very much for your presentation and for collecting the perspectives of students throughout Canada. From your perceptions, what seems to be the priority or primary value for Canadians and their vision of Canada?

Mr Huston: The primary concern?

Mr Malkowski: Yes, or the values; the priority of values or primary value.

Mr Huston: We have held four discussions so far, one at the University of Ottawa, one at Carleton University and one at southern Ontario high schools.

The reactions students had were somewhat different, but there was a genuine concern over the national unity question. There is a great deal of frustration and anger towards Quebec, and many individuals were either indifferent towards Quebec separation or were somewhat enthusiastic over the prospect. In terms of economics, surprisingly, high school students did express a large concern over pensions and the pension fund and the challenge they were facing over the next 10, 20 years as the pension fund depletes and as our population gets older. They will, of course, have to bear the burden, and there is a large concern over that.

In addition, there is a large concern over the bilingualism question, a lot of criticism of the current education system which, in the words of one student, felt like French being rammed down their throats rather than encouraged. Also, of course, the multicultural issue, the encouraging of the cultural mosaic by the federal and various provincial governments; some individuals were very enthusiastic to-

wards the whole idea of having a multicultural society in which everyone is a small individual piece of a grander whole, whereas other individuals were expressing a bias or more of an interest towards the American melting-pot system. Christine, did you have anything to add?

Ms Fontaine: One more point would be the lack of commonality Canadians hold. The question was raised that Canadians have a lot of differences. We recognize all the differences we hold. However, the common elements that do tie us all together were a main concern—or the lack of a common element was one of the issues brought up.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for your presentation. Are you using a document or a set of questions when you are staging these forums?

Ms Fontaine: Yes, we have a set of questions. During the discussion as such, when we get together with these people and hold these forums, we have approximately 10 questions we try to use in order to keep the discussions structured, to not take off on different tangents. We have 10 main issues that are found in these questions; examples of those are Canadian unity as such, Quebec sovereignty, native issues, and several other questions to encourage discussion.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you got our document, *Changing for the Better*?

Mr Huston: Yes, we do have that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could you say a little about the other side of the coin? You are talking about similar things going on in the west and the Maritimes. They have some connection with you?

Mr Huston: Yes. We have, as I said, 12 members in total. We have a delegation from those 12 travelling across the western provinces as we speak, and a second group travelling around the Atlantic provinces.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: And they will all come together in the one document with yours, then.

Mr Huston: That is correct.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I hope you will send our committee a copy. Thank you very much for taking the interest to come.

Mr Huston: If you would like a copy, we will send you one.

The Chair: We would appreciate that.

Mr Offer: I guess that last comment is the first point I wanted to make, that when you do finish your document all of us would very much appreciate receiving a copy of your findings, but I understand from your presentation that that is going to be in the fall or summer.

Mr Huston: No, we are hoping to have it done by the end of March, because of exams coming up in April, as we are students, after all, and also because we would like to get most of this work out of the way for the summer so we can pursue our other interests.

Mr Offer: And your discussions which are taking place in Quebec will be incorporated into the March document?

Mr Huston: Yes, they will.

Mr Offer: Can you give us a little more information about what your forum is doing in terms of the discussions that are taking place with the students in Quebec? I think that as a committee we would be very interested to hear the perspectives not only from Ontario but indeed from other provinces such as Quebec.

Mr Huston: I am afraid we do not have any final date set up in Quebec as yet, as up until now we have been concentrating on the western provinces and Atlantic Canada, mainly because of the logistics problems involved in that. We have had a chance to talk with some Quebec students at the university level in this region and the overall impression I had received from those students is that the province mainly wants to preserve its present culture and its present language. Some of the members had said that this was the overall reason behind, for example, some of the requests made in the Allaire report, and that seems to be a general thrust. In terms of the sovereignty-federalism option, that was not really brought up in the discussions by these students.

Mr Offer: I will just close by indicating that certainly we as a committee do appreciate and wish you well as you have embarked on a process not only within one province but indeed throughout the country. I think that your findings will be very important. Please share those with our committee by forwarding us a copy of your findings. Thank you.

1110

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : Je voudrais maintenant appeler Marielle Beaulieu de l'Association canadienne-française d'Ottawa-Carleton.

Mme Beaulieu : Messieurs, mesdames, Monsieur le Président du comité, l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, Conseil régional d'Ottawa-Carleton, est heureuse de pouvoir présenter aujourd'hui son point de vue sur les aspirations et les intérêts sociaux et économiques de tous les résidents de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, ainsi que la forme de Confédération qui est la plus apte à satisfaire les aspirations sociales et économiques des résidents de l'Ontario.

L'ACFO, Conseil régional d'Ottawa-Carleton, a pour objectif principal la promotion des intérêts des francophones de la région. Elle est une des 22 associations régionales qui, avec 21 organismes provinciaux affiliés, constitue l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, ACFO provinciale, qui est reconnue comme la principale porte-parole des Franco-Ontariens.

C'est une redéfinition toute entière du pays qui nous amène aujourd'hui à venir discuter avec vous de notre vision de l'Ontario dans la constitution de demain.

Nous, Canadiens français vivant en Ontario, avons réussi au cours des ans à mettre sur pied et à développer de solides institutions florissantes qui nous sont propres. Nous avons des racines dans cette province qui remontent au tout début de la présence française en Amérique du Nord. De génération en génération, nous avons su doter l'Ontario d'un patrimoine culturel que l'Assemblée légis-

lative a reconnu et a déclaré vouloir sauvegarder pour les générations futures, comme en fait foi le préambule de la Loi de 1986 sur les services en français : «Attendu que la langue française a joué en Ontario un rôle historique et honorable, et que la Constitution lui reconnaît le statut de langue officielle au Canada ; attendu que cette langue jouit, en Ontario, du statut de langue officielle devant les tribunaux et dans l'éducation ; attendu que l'Assemblée législative reconnaît l'apport du patrimoine culturel de la population francophone et désire le sauvegarder pour les générations à venir ; et attendu qu'il est souhaitable de garantir l'emploi de la langue française dans les institutions de la Législature et du gouvernement de l'Ontario comme le prévoit la présente Loi...»

Le patriotisme franco-ontarien est fort. Il l'est aujourd'hui qu'il l'était au début du siècle, lors de la lutte farouche menée contre l'infâme Règlement 17 qui prohibait l'enseignement du français dans les écoles de l'Ontario. Ce patriotisme, ce sens de l'appartenance, s'exprime aujourd'hui de différentes façons dont, en termes économiques, des institutions tels le mouvement des caisses populaires, la Fondation franco-ontarienne dont le mandat est d'appuyer financièrement tout ce qui peut assurer le fait français, et le Regroupement des gens d'affaires de l'Outaouais, pour n'en nommer que quelques-unes.

Il y a en outre les jeunes qui de plus en plus sont conscients de leur appartenance à la collectivité francophone et à qui on doit des initiatives remarquables, comme la création et la mise en onde de radios communautaires. Toute une nouvelle génération est en voie de formation qui donnera à l'Ontario français des travailleurs compétents. La création cette année du premier collège de langue française d'arts appliqués et de technologie et la création prochaine de deux autres de ces collèges, un pour le Nord, l'autre pour la région de Toronto et le sud de la province, ces collèges nous garantissent de la formation adéquate et française pour ces jeunes et aussi pour les adultes en quête de recyclage.

La mise sur pied éventuel de nombreux conseils scolaires homogènes contribuera aussi à accroître le nombre de francophones dans des écoles qui leur appartiennent. Tout ce mouvement de prise en charge des mécanismes éducatifs et de formation a été acquis peu à peu et souvent après de longues batailles. Nous sommes fiers de ces institutions qui nous ressemblent. Nous pourrions parler longuement aussi de mécanismes culturels, artistiques qui eux aussi contribuent grandement à la vie franco-ontarienne.

Il n'est pas inutile de rappeler, au risque d'être accusé d'énoncer une évidence, qu'il s'impose que les Canadiens français, à cette période critique dans l'histoire du pays, oublient leurs frontières et s'appliquent à examiner ensemble ce qui les unit : la langue, leurs origines communes, l'immense territoire que constitue le Canada qu'ils ont exploré et des liens culturels indissolubles. Nous sommes présents partout au Canada, dans toutes les provinces et territoires regroupés dans les grandes villes, les petits villages et dans des communautés isolées. Nous formons une patrie entière de ces pays.

L'Ontario a un rôle de leadership à jouer dans la redéfinition d'un Canada de demain, et en premier la constitu-

ion doit reconnaître les trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit les communautés autochtones, francophone et anglophone.

La constitution doit reconnaître, évidemment, l'apport historique et culturel de notre communauté qui, avec la communauté anglophone, a particulièrement contribué à bâtir ce pays. Le rôle historique et honorable que nos communautés ont joué leur confère un statut égal. Il s'impose enfin de rappeler le rôle prépondérant de la communauté francophone dans la découverte et le développement de l'Ontario, rôle qui remonte à plus de trois siècles. Cette même constitution doit également reconnaître l'apport des générations successives de néo-Canadiens au développement de l'une ou de l'autre de ces communautés nationales.

Il est essentiel que les structures canadiennes maintiennent leur bilinguisme dans les institutions gouvernementales. En Ontario, il est essentiel que la province déclare le français langue officielle comme le Nouveau-Brunswick l'a fait. De plus, il est essentiel que les textes portant sur le droit à l'éducation soient suffisamment clairs pour éviter d'avoir recours aux tribunaux pour le faire respecter.

La constitution canadienne doit reconnaître l'égalité des chances des trois communautés et leur droit au bien-être et à une vie de qualité. Elles seraient aussi assurées de recevoir les services publics essentiels dans leur langue maternelle. Sans restreindre la généralité de ce qui précède pour la communauté francophone, ces services sont, outre le secteur scolaire, les secteurs suivants : le juridique, les services sociaux et communautaires et de la santé, les services municipaux, le culturel et la communication.

Ce droit à l'égalité des chances doit par ailleurs être assorti de dispositions constitutionnelles concernant l'engagement des gouvernements fédéral et provincial de promouvoir cette égalité par des politiques et des programmes appropriés.

Lors de la présentation de l'ACFO devant la commission Bélanger-Campeau au Québec, il avait été suggéré qu'un partenariat avec le Québec soit établi. Il a aussi été mentionné que peu importe le statut que choisira ce dernier, autant l'Ontario français a besoin d'un Québec fort, autant celui-ci a-t-il besoin d'un Ontario français fort et prospère. Car le Québec est en pleine effervescence économique et, à l'instar de ses pionniers, grands voyageurs et explorateurs, s'est tourné résolument vers l'extérieur, en outre, le Canada anglais et ses marchés lucratifs dont celui évidemment de l'Ontario.

Or, qui pourrait mieux appuyer cette expansion que les intermédiaires précieux que constituent les Canadiens français déjà établis de vieille date en Ontario, province à l'échelle d'un pays dont ils possèdent la langue et connaissent bien les mentalités, surtout celles des milieux professionnels et d'affaires ? Leur expérience et leurs connaissances sont des atouts inestimables, comme semble l'avoir découvert le mouvement des caisses populaires qui travaille maintenant en étroite collaboration avec la Fédération des caisses populaires de l'Ontario. Par ailleurs, ces Canadiens français de l'Ontario sont des alliés naturels et sympathiques au départ et n'ont pas, précieux avantage, à être éduqués sur la véritable nature du Québec et de sa population.

L'Ontario constitue un marché de choix pour le Québec, que ce soit pour les produits manufacturés ou pour les produits culturels. Par exemple, en ce qui concerne ces derniers, il ne se passe pas une semaine sans que des localités ou des écoles françaises ou d'immersion en Ontario et ailleurs au Canada n'accueillent des troupes et artistes québécois, pour qui ces tournées représentent un excellent apprentissage et une source de revenus appréciables. La popularité de programmes d'immersion prouve bien que le bilinguisme ou l'apprentissage de la langue française n'est pas une imposition mais un enrichissement culturel.

1120

Le bon sens voudrait qu'on tire le meilleur parti de la présente situation créée autant par l'histoire que par la géographie. Pourquoi alors ne pas transformer notre voisinage en un partenariat fondé sur le respect mutuel, en une synergie féconde susceptible de réaliser notre destin de grand peuple axé sur le succès.

Comment établir ce partenariat ? Les possibilités sont multiples et l'on pourrait au départ prévoir sans même devoir créer de nouvelles structures : des échanges institutionnels en français au niveau des entreprises et des regroupements professionnels du secteur non gouvernemental ; l'accès pour les membres de la collectivité française de l'Ontario aux programmes québécois d'enseignement supérieur et autres — et ce ne sont que des exemples.

Les francophones de l'Ontario sont toujours vivants et font sentir leur présence partout dans la province, en application de la devise de l'ACFO : « Nous sommes, nous serons ». Fait non négligeable, nous constituerons toujours pour le Québec un partenaire et un marché de premier ordre, d'autant plus accessible qu'il est facilement identifiable et que ses éléments possèdent, il va sans dire, un préjugé favorable à son égard sans pour autant renier l'aléance à l'Ontario, notre patrie. Nous sommes Ontariens et nous le resterons, quoiqu'il advienne.

Dans le Canada de demain, les changements constitutionnels qui y seront apportés devront refléter la dynamique de la société canadienne et son évolution. Les Canadiens doivent avoir la possibilité de gérer les structures politiques et administratives des services pertinents à leur épanouissement. Le statut égal de la communauté francophone doit nécessairement se refléter dans l'organisation des pouvoirs tant au palier fédéral, provincial que municipal. La province de l'Ontario est stratégiquement en mesure de jouer un rôle très important sinon primordial dans la redéfinition canadienne. L'Ontario peut exercer une influence importante entre les partisans de changements importants et ceux qui désirent le statu quo. Les enjeux sociaux, politiques et économiques de la décennie que nous venons de débiter doivent amener des changements qui sont, à notre avis, nécessaires à notre société en grande mutation.

À cet effet, nous reconnaissons à notre province la capacité, de même que l'ouverture d'esprit, pour originer des changements si nécessaires au mieux-être collectif et particulièrement au mieux-être de la communauté francophone canadienne et ontarienne.

Dans cette redéfinition de demain, il faudra revoir les fondements de notre fédéralisme. L'Ontario se devra de jouer un rôle de leader car c'est le Haut- et le Bas-Canada qui depuis la fondation de notre pays sont les acteurs principaux et c'est à l'Ontario d'y prendre sa place dans cette redéfinition.

M. Bisson : Une question : vous avez mentionné dans votre présentation que l'Ontario et le Québec devraient former une manière de partnership. Pourriez-vous élaborer un peu ? Je n'ai pas tellement compris exactement à quel point vous parlez.

Mme Beaulieu : Nous, on voit la très grande importance d'un partenariat entre le Québec et l'Ontario, partenariat dont on mentionnait particulièrement aux niveaux de l'éducation, d'échanges et aussi économique. À notre avis, l'Ontario est jusqu'à présent devenu, je pense, un partenaire commercial très important au Québec, et vice versa. Et ce lien se doit d'être renforcé. De plus, les Canadiens français qui vivent en Ontario représentent des gens qui peuvent très facilement transiger avec les Québécois de souche.

M. Beer : J'aimerais suivre un peu la question de M. Bisson et je pense que, parce que nous sommes ici dans la région de la capitale nationale, il est clair que vous aimeriez parler de partenariats entre les deux provinces. Est-ce que vous pensez que, à l'intérieur de cette perspective, on peut prévenir même par exemple la création d'une université qui puisse servir les deux de la rivière mais où les deux provinces peut-être vont participer dans le financement ? On sait fort bien qu'à la Cité collégiale il y a des étudiants du Québec, à l'Université d'Ottawa, des étudiants du Québec. On parle ici peut-être de créer une université de langue française. Mais est-ce que ce serait une bonne idée de voir si les deux provinces pourraient coopérer d'une façon très étroite sur des projets comme ça ?

Mme Beaulieu : Soit explorer ce partenariat-là au niveau de l'éducation postsecondaire en particulier. Vous avez mentionné toute à l'heure l'Université d'Ottawa et la Cité collégiale, qui reçoivent des étudiants du Québec. Moi, je vous dirais que l'Université du Québec à Hull reçoit aussi beaucoup d'étudiants ontariens. Alors il y a déjà, évidemment, au niveau du Québec et de l'Ontario quand on parle d'Ottawa, tout un partenariat, il y a déjà tout un réseau, il y a aussi tout un échange qui se fait quand on regarde notamment les organismes, quand on regarde aussi les gens d'affaires. Le Regroupement des gens d'affaires, évidemment, c'est un grand nombre de gens d'affaires qui proviennent et du milieu ontarien et du milieu québécois. Et, évidemment, les échanges sont très riches pour ces gens. Alors, certainement, nous pensons qu'il faut aller de l'avant en ce sens-là et puis nous avons vu finalement, au cours des dernières années, une très grande ouverture d'esprit, puis au-delà de l'ouverture d'esprit un partage encore plus large. Nous croyons, comme nous le disons dans le mémoire, que l'Ontario a un rôle très grand à jouer présentement dans le Canada de demain, particulièrement au niveau du Québec.

Mr Harnick : We have been to various locations around Ontario and we have seen a number of presenta-

tions from people—I am talking about people from the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada and from the Reform Party and from the Confederation of Regions party—who are very much against the amount of French that the government now provides in Ontario. They are certainly very much against the idea of official bilingualism for Ontario, which I know is your position. Is Bill 8 a mechanism by which we can find some compromise among all of these divergent views?

Ms Beaulieu : That is a very specific question. I myself see Bill 8 as being a step towards bilingualism. As we mentioned earlier, we said that we are hoping that eventually Ontario will become a bilingual province, as New Brunswick did a while ago. That is our position, and we believe firmly that this is the only way that French Canadian living in this province will have a place in this province.

Mr Harnick : Is Bill 8 an effective enough tool as a method of compromise between, say, APEC and ACFO?

Ms Beaulieu : I do not like this idea of compromise because to me it is not a compromise. Bill 8 is something that was—I was going to say it was due to us, meaning something that acknowledges the fact that there are francophones all over the country and a fair amount of francophones in this province. So to me it is not a compromise. It is something that should have been done a long time ago. We are sure hoping that Bill 8 is a step towards an achievement greater than what it is right now.

The Chair : Merci pour votre présentation.

1130

DIRECTION-JEUNESSE

The Chair : We will proceed then to Lyne Michaud of Direction-Jeunesse.

Mme Michaud : Nous aimerions d'abord vous remercier très sincèrement de nous donner une occasion de vous présenter notre point de vue au sujet du rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération canadienne.

Puisque Direction-Jeunesse représente quelque 104 000 jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes âgés entre 15 et 30 ans, notre mémoire portera surtout sur la question 5 posée par votre comité. Par contre, certains éléments de notre mémoire touchent directement aux questions 1, 2, 3 et 6.

Direction-Jeunesse vous présente les aspirations et intérêts d'un segment de la population ontarienne qui apportera une contribution indéniable à l'évolution de la province. En effet, le jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes ne demandent rien de moins que de pouvoir participer pleinement à la vie socioéconomique de l'Ontario en respectant leur spécificité culturelle et linguistique.

«Au service des jeunes de l'Ontario français depuis 25 ans, Direction-Jeunesse se veut un organisme de représentation, d'information et de revendication au nom de la jeunesse. De fait, Direction-Jeunesse est un outil d'intervention et de développement social en plus d'être un lieu de formation et une voix provinciale». Notre action s'effectue à l'échelle locale, régionale et provinciale et ce au sein des secteurs suivants : éducation, travail-emploi et communauté.

Nous avons comme principe de base que le français fait partie intégrante du développement du potentiel des quelque 104 000 jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes que nous représentons.

Les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes ici depuis longtemps et pour toujours. Les francophones ont toujours été présents à l'Ontario et le seront toujours. Il ne reste qu'à s'assurer de leur plein épanouissement pour régler plusieurs problèmes d'ordre politique ou linguistique. Nous voulons notre place ici car c'est chez nous.

Notre présence et notre contribution à cette province. Depuis 350 ans, des gens d'expression française vivent et travaillent en Ontario. Des centaines de milliers de Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes ont contribué à l'essor de cette province. Mais notre apport est loin d'être purement historique. Aujourd'hui, notre communauté possède des acquis bien à elle, à partir desquels nous bâtissons notre avenir. À titre d'organisme provincial, nous travaillons à partir de certains acquis qui témoignent de notre présence et de notre contribution à la province de l'Ontario et j'en cite quelques exemples.

Au niveau des entreprises : nous avons 8000 entreprises en Ontario qui sont appartenues par des francophones. Au niveau des médias, par exemple, des journaux, nous avons le journal *Le Nord*, de Hearst ; *Le Goût de vivre*, de Penetanguishene ; *La Boîte à nouvelles* ; *Le Droit* et j'en passe et j'en passe.

Au niveau des centres culturels : on a un centre culturel à Hawkesbury, à Timmins, à Windsor, à Sudbury et j'en passe. Bref, comme vous pouvez constater, la francophonie ontarienne est bien ancrée et possède déjà un grand nombre d'institutions bien à elle. Mais les objectifs de notre communauté ne s'arrêtent pas là. Nous voulons nous épanouir et gérer toutes les institutions nécessaires à cet épanouissement.

Nous avons le droit, et je repète, le droit d'être et d'évoluer en Ontario français. Le gouvernement provincial s'est engagé par la création de la Loi 8 à desservir les francophones dans leur langue lorsque ces derniers font appel aux services gouvernementaux. La Loi comporte certaines lacunes, notamment le principe de la désignation de la région, où par exemple les 4500 francophones de London ne peuvent souscrire à la Loi et l'exclusion des institutions universitaires et des municipalités et agences et autres.

Ce qu'il nous faut pour nous épanouir. Bien que la communauté soit une force vivante et que le français soit belle et bien présent en Ontario, il ne faut pas ignorer le danger réel que l'assimilation linguistique et culturelle porte à notre population. Un consensus évident se dresse quant aux moyens qu'il faut mettre en place afin d'enrayer l'assimilation chez la population franco-ontarienne. Je vous donne quelques recommandations et quelques exemples.

Il faut créer des milieux majoritaires francophones, par exemple : des institutions d'éducation, des centres culturels, des médias, des activités économiques. Et il faut réaffirmer la volonté politique des dirigeants et dirigeantes gouvernementaux à l'égard de la survie et de la promotion du français, surtout lors de cette période d'incertitude face à l'avenir de notre pays.

Au secteur d'éducation, j'en cite quelques exemples. Il faut mettre sur pied des institutions postsecondaires francophones, dont une université de langue française et un réseau complet de collèges francophones.

Il faut créer des structures gouvernementales francophones, par exemple, le ministère des Collèges et Universités, le ministère de l'Éducation, le Conseil des régents et des régentes avec des comités consultatifs régionaux.

Il faut intensifier le nombre de programmes d'études complets offerts en français aux collèges et à l'université. Il faut augmenter l'aide financière offerte aux étudiants francophones. Il faut rendre la vie étudiante attrayante et diversifiée. Il faut valoriser l'implication communautaire des étudiants et étudiantes. Il faut aussi sensibiliser les professeurs des collèges et universités à notre réalité franco-ontarienne.

Au secteur communautaire, j'en cite deux exemples. Il faut mettre sur pied des centres et des regroupements de jeunes partout où le besoin est manifesté par les jeunes. Il faut persuader des conseils scolaires à embaucher des animateurs et animatrices culturels.

Au secteur communication, il faut mettre sur pied tous les médias qui nous manquent selon la région. Il faut rendre disponible pour chaque foyer francophone la chaîne française de TVOntario. Il nous faut sensibiliser particulièrement le Conseil de la radiodiffusion et des télécommunications du Canada, soit le CRTC, à l'importance pour les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes de recevoir des services de base dans notre langue. Nous croyons qu'une communauté en évolution doit nécessairement compter sur un éventail complet de projets. Ceux-ci sont un témoignage de la force vivante et de la volonté d'exister des francophones en Ontario.

Les Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens et la redéfinition du Canada. Quoique le Québec décide sur son avenir, une chose est certaine : il y aura toujours une présence française vivante en Ontario et ailleurs au Canada, et les dirigeants et dirigeantes politiques devront tenir compte de cette réalité dans leur redéfinition du Canada. Nous ne sommes pas un pion dans le jeu politique du Canada et nous n'accepterons jamais d'être sacrifiés pour la paix linguistique au Canada. Qui refuse d'accepter l'existence et les droits d'un peuple le fait à son péril. Ce que les jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes veulent, ce n'est pas d'imposer leur langue mais tout simplement pouvoir exister en français et s'épanouir tout en contribuant au mieux-être de leur province et de leur pays.

Nous sommes ici depuis longtemps et nous sommes aussi Ontariens et Ontariennes, Canadiens et Canadiennes que n'importe qui en Ontario ou au Canada. Cette réalité doit être reconnue par ceux et celles qui s'imaginent que si le Québec se sépare, il n'y aura plus de francophones au Canada. Au contraire, il en restera un million, près de deux millions si on compte les néo-Canadiens et néo-Canadiennes d'expression française et les gens qui peuvent parler le français. Cette présence dans chaque province continuera et le nouveau Canada se doit de continuer d'accorder une juste place à la francophonie canadienne.

La constitution doit reconnaître les trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit les communautés

autochtones, francophone et anglophone. La constitution doit également reconnaître l'apport des générations successives de néo-Canadiens et néo-Canadiennes au développement de l'une ou l'autre de ces communautés autochtones, francophone et anglophone.

Pour conclure : en cette période d'incertitude, les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes jeunes, adultes et âgés répondent massivement à l'appel du gouvernement de l'Ontario. Un grand nombre d'entre eux se présentent devant votre comité pour témoigner de la force de la communauté francophone en Ontario, de son enracinement dans cette province, de leur besoin d'épanouissement. Ils et elles tiennent à ce que le gouvernement ontarien les appuie et à ce que la communauté canadienne respecte leurs droits.

Leur témoignages et présentations affirment leur présence et leur vitalité. Les Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens, peuple en plein droit, tiennent à prendre leur place dans un nouveau Canada qui respectera la diversité linguistique et culturelle de ses citoyens et citoyennes.

M. le Président : Il y a des questions. Mr Malkowski.

Mr Malkowski: I am certainly very impressed with your presentation. You mentioned at one point about the three communities having to be recognized—francophones, anglophones and the native communities. Do you see the recognition of other cultures and other groups, such as women's rights and the rights of disabled people? Should they be formally recognized as well in the Constitution, in your opinion?

1140

Mme Michaud : Je pense qu'on doit reconnaître qu'il y a trois peuples fondateurs, autochtones, anglophone et francophone. Concernant les autres minorités, je pense que ça va de soi au niveau des handicapés, des femmes, tout ce qui fait part de minorités, mais c'est ça notre rôle, et quand on arrive aux minorités, c'est de les protéger tout droit. C'est ce qui en fait la richesse de notre province au niveau du Canada aussi, c'est tout l'aspect de la richesse multiculturelle et la richesse des différents groupes minoritaires en Ontario.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. You have spoken in your presentation about the continuing progress of francophone interest in dealing with schools, community centres, businesses, communications and the like, and you have carried on by talking about how those aspects and others must continue to advance within the province of Ontario and that that is the role, responsibility and in fact challenge of the government of Ontario.

My question to you is that your presentation has been directed to those rights within the province of Ontario and I would like to hear your opinion as to whether—not so much a decreasing of these rights, but whether you feel that the advancement of these rights will be threatened in the event that Quebec separates or distances itself from the rest of Canada, and second, what role you see Ontario playing, not only in advancing the rights of francophones in Ontario, but rather advancing the rights of all within the country of Canada?

Mme Michaud : En ce qui concerne le rôle du Québec par rapport à sa définition, comment ça va nous affecter chez nous, je dois répondre par le fait que chez nous on vit un processus. Qu'est-ce que le Québec fait chez lui ? C'est de ses affaires. Qu'est-ce qui se passe chez nous ? C'est de mes affaires. Ce que mes grands-parents avaient au niveau de services en français, au niveau de l'éducation, par exemple, les écoles secondaires existent au moins depuis les années 70 en Ontario français. Ça va continuer. Maintenant on a nos écoles élémentaires, secondaires, nos premiers collèges francophones. Notre université, on l'espère bien pour l'année 1995. C'est le processus. On va toujours continuer à faire du chemin et toujours continuer à bâtir. Donc, peu importe ce qui se passe au niveau du Québec, eux vont continuer de grandir peu importe les réformes auxquelles ils se décideront. Nous aussi on veut continuer à vivre en Ontario.

Au sujet de l'unité canadienne, quel est le rôle de l'Ontario par rapport à la place du Québec, je crois qu'on doit respecter leurs demandes et de ce dont ils ont besoin. Au sujet de ce que le Québec fait et ce que le Québec demande, c'est à eux-mêmes de s'autodéterminer, c'est à eux-mêmes de décider ce qu'ils veulent. C'est à nous de les respecter, c'est à nous de travailler avec eux. Ce n'est pas à nous en tant que population ou en tant que province de discuter de la place des autres. Je crois que chaque province doit se respecter et que les provinces ensemble on doit travailler à l'épanouissement du Canada.

NEW FEDERATION

The Chair: Could I call next Jean Chevrier of the New Federation magazine?

Mr Chevrier: If I may, I would speak in English, Mr Chairman, since the article which I wrote in the New Federation magazine, in the January-February issue—our special issue on constitutional reform—is in English. I would like to thank members of the committee for this opportunity and your invitation to talk about a new Canada. I would like to focus, if I may, not on the whole article but on some key proposals for reform for this new Canada. I would like to do so on the basis of the global picture, if I may, and based also on what other past commissions, past studies, have proposed for this country over the years.

The first proposal, which I believe is necessary in Canada today, is a new institution which would bring the provinces and the federal government together at the centre to better co-ordinate and harmonize their policies in the economic sector. The latest politician to request that has been Premier Bourassa when he has called for a new superstructure, but he was merely saying things that many others have said before in this country. A number of bodies, including the Economic Council of Canada in its latest report have called for more provincial input into national economic decision-making.

In 1965 Quebec's Faribault and Ontario's Fowler proposed a fiscal commission in the Confederation wager. In 1971 the Ontario government of Bill Davis proposed a joint economic council to review and determine on a continuing basis national economic goals of a strategic order. For its part, the Macdonald commission recommended the estab-

lishment of three central ministerial councils: one devoted to finance and treasury matters, one to economic development and another to social policy. So when Premier Bourassa refers to a new political structure to oversee the monetary, fiscal and economic interests of both nations, he is speaking the same language as many others, and I believe resurrecting an idea whose time has come.

I see this special institution possibly as a fourth institution in the country, possibly equal to the Senate, the Supreme Court and Parliament. It would be up to the provinces and the federal government, through their representatives, to establish the working relationship. The decisions could be binding on the federal government under certain conditions or it could only have an advisory stature, something akin to the economic and social committee which is tied to the European Community in Europe.

1150

I would like to go now to the second proposal for reform, if I may, and that is, of course—everybody is talking about it now; the premiers, the Prime Minister—a new division of powers basically with one key objective, to reduce and eliminate, if possible, the amount of overlapping and duplication which has arisen in our system ever since the provinces themselves have developed into full-fledged modern governments.

In order to arrive at a structure which would in a way pave the way to a more equitable, more equal partnership, with each province having more or less the same powers, I think we would have to look at the concept of regions, because I believe only then will we avoid giving Quebec a special status and only then would reunited provinces in the west and in the Maritimes be able to capture a larger field of the domestic field in Canada. These provinces would not need to unite politically, necessarily, but as Premier McKenna and the Maritimes have said, they could certainly speak with one voice on the national level and possibly the interprovincial level as well. So this would make possible the fact that each regional administration could then exercise jurisdiction over a larger field of domestic matters such as employment, education, culture, regional development, health and family policy.

Ottawa's base will then become more clearly identified with the management and direction of the economy, the fiscal and monetary issues. If it has those powers on the economy, then it has the key power in Canada. In addition, of course, it would continue to exercise jurisdiction over a wide range of international activities, foreign policy, international trade, customs and excise, citizenship, defence, aid, space, fisheries and oceans, agriculture to some extent, immigration also to some extent. Everything that has an international component, as I see it, should belong to the federal government.

I might also add on the distribution of power that there would be nothing preventing the federal government from exercising some jurisdiction even in provincial areas under a modified version of the power to legislate for peace, order and government. It could have the power to establish studies, look at these questions and make recommendations afterwards to the provinces. It would be up to the prov-

inces, however, to decide if they would accept the federal advisory power or recommendations in these areas.

I would like to go now to a third proposal, that of Senate reform. If we give the provinces more power at the front end of the system, that is, in a new economic body at the centre, and if we give them extra powers also, then it becomes less important that they have additional powers at the tail end of the system, that is, in a reformed Senate. I would much rather that the Senate of Canada be used as a completely new body, something which would get us away from partisan politics, if possible, and into a more innovative proposal.

We could, for instance, try to see where Canada differentiates itself from the Americans. The Canadian mosaic certainly is one way that could be considered. For instance, the Senate could be made up of an equal portion of French, English and people of other origins. I believe 50% should be female in a new Senate; after all, we are looking towards the future, towards the year 2000. As far as the appointments or proposals for nominations of those new senators are concerned, they could come from countless organizations that exist in the country at the cultural level. A modified version also of that Senate could be that the new senators could come from different backgrounds: education, science, environment, labour. There is a whole network of these organizations, human resources which have not been tapped in this country. These organizations could themselves propose names of new senators and the final selection could belong to the Prime Minister or to a select committee of both houses in Ottawa.

In concluding, I go to a fourth proposal. I think what would be needed is a sort of bold and spirited declaration at the beginning of our new Constitution, something which could serve for all Canadians as a modern mission statement for the 21st century. What is Canada? What are its goals, its objectives? What are the shared values? I think it would be important from an educational perspective to make sure that everybody has something in hand they could point to as far as the respect we should have for each other's values is concerned. I am not going to go into these specific values, but I am sure that others have recommended some of those, and I think I have used my time. I will stop at this point.

Ms Churley: Thank you for your presentation. I wish we had more time to hear some of your views, but certainly we can read more about it later.

You mentioned something that I think the majority of people are saying, that we need some kind of change, and there are varying degrees of that. You talk about some of your ideas of which jurisdictional functions can be divided between provinces and Ottawa. I think that is where we get into difficulties, of what should go where. I would just like to know, for instance, what you think about the environment, which you did not mention specifically. But as you may be aware, that is becoming an issue, with the Oldman River dam case going on. Of course the environment knows no boundaries. It is an international as well as federal responsibility, in a sense. At the same time, I think provinces are trying to hang on to it.

I am just wondering how you would propose, first, to deal with the environment, and, second, how you would propose to deal with some of the other issues, for instance, social programs and a fear that they could be watered down from province to province.

Mr Chevrier: So far as the environment is concerned, as I mentioned in the article, I would see it as a joint responsibility, because, after all, it has, as you were saying, very much some international dimensions. I would see it as a joint responsibility.

As far as the overall distribution of powers is concerned, there is one key sector which I believe could belong more to the provinces or to regrouped regions, the whole area of social policy. As matters stand now, for instance, you have some parts which are under provincial control and others under federal control, and that makes it very hard for provincial governments to establish priorities and to have a good look into the overall sector.

For instance, the provinces established the minimum wage. They also give supplementary benefits in terms of old age pensions; they also deal with workers' compensation. Then you have the federal government, which has unemployment insurance, family allowance, which is a family matter. If this whole sector of social affairs belonged to Ontario, to Quebec, to a much stronger Maritimes, if they did put their act together, the same thing with the western premiers, then I think you would have a shift, naturally, towards the regions and the provinces.

But we should not think that would dismember Canada or bring it apart. I do not think so. There are so many more activities now in the 20th century that were not there in 1867, such as the environment. The international sector has exploded as far as that is concerned, so that is giving Ottawa a lot more powers than it had before. And if they have command over the economy, then they have jurisdiction over the key sector, naturally, which they should have. I believe you could find a very equitable balance this way, and one which would go a long way to meet Quebec's demands in particular.

Now the question remains whether the other provinces would want to have access to exactly the overall social field in Canada. I think Ontario could certainly handle its own there, individual Maritime provinces perhaps not, but if they did come together into one regional unit, then I think they could certainly do it, and the same thing with the western provinces.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Chevrier. Merci.

1200

FÉDÉRATION DES FEMMES CANADIENNES-FRANÇAISES DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : Je vais maintenant inviter Fleurette Millette, de la Fédération des femmes canadiennes-françaises de l'Ontario.

Mme Millette : Monsieur Silipo, mesdames, messieurs, la Fédération apprécie l'occasion qui lui est donnée de présenter ce mémoire au comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération. La Fédération des femmes canadiennes-françaises de l'Ontario est un organisme voué à sensibiliser les femmes, à susciter tout change-

ment permettant l'expansion de la culture et de la langue française et à promouvoir l'égalité des femmes afin d'édifier une société plus juste.

Notre organisme, fondé à Ottawa en 1914, n'est reconnu toutefois comme association provinciale que depuis 1987. Si la Fédération des femmes canadiennes-françaises de l'Ontario se prononce sur la question du rôle de l'Ontario dans la Confédération, c'est que nous voulons, en tant que femmes et en tant que femmes francophones de l'Ontario, en profiter pour faire connaître le but de notre travail. Cela nous apparaît d'autant plus important étant donné qu'aucune femme francophone ne siège sur le comité spécial.

Il faut se rappeler le rôle important qu'a joué la communauté francophone dans la découverte et le développement de l'Ontario, rôle qui remonte à plus de trois siècles.

Les femmes francophones ontariennes se sont impliquées en grand nombre dans la lutte pour la reconnaissance des droits des francophones afin d'obtenir des écoles et des services en français dans les communautés, exemple : la lutte contre le Règlement 17 en 1916.

«L'héritage francophone est un flambeau difficile à porter au Canada malgré notre conscientisation. La transmission de la culture est une responsabilité partagée avec le conjoint, la famille, la communauté» et je pourrai dire la province et le pays.

Une véritable égalité entre hommes et femmes. Dans plusieurs secteurs, les femmes sont encore cantonnées à des ghettos d'emplois et sont souvent sous-représentées dans des métiers ou des postes traditionnellement réservés aux hommes. Même si les femmes représentent — on dit que c'est plus de 70% de la main-d'œuvre salariée — elles sont sous-représentées aux niveaux supérieurs dans l'administration et dans la majorité des postes. Par exemple, en septembre 1985 on comptait 39 directeurs d'école mais seulement quatre directrices.

La représentation aux différents paliers gouvernementaux ne reflète pas le statut égal de la communauté francophone, encore moins celui de la femme francophone, par exemple : l'attribution des postes clés. Les initiatives du gouvernement de l'Ontario ont eu des impacts positifs en matière de condition féminine. Nous notons la récente nomination de onze femmes au Cabinet provincial, aucune femme francophone, malheureusement.

Une femme qui revendique ses droits sait qu'elle doit non seulement convaincre ses conseillers, mais qu'elle hérite aussi de la responsabilité de sensibiliser les hommes à la nécessité d'un changement de mentalité.

Au cours des années 1980-81 les femmes, en tant que citoyennes, ont participé au débat qui a entouré l'élaboration de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés. L'article 28 assure l'égalité entre femmes et hommes. Rappelons que ces droits sont sujets à une interprétation judiciaire provenant des tribunaux provinciaux et fédéraux dont la Cour suprême.

Les dispositions de la Charte canadienne ont produit jusqu'ici peu de jurisprudence favorable aux femmes : interprétations souvent peu adaptées au concept d'égalité entre femmes et hommes.

Le débat sur l'avenir politique et constitutionnel de l'Ontario offre une occasion privilégiée de définir nos prises de position face aux changements anticipés.

Nous croyons que l'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle répondérant :

Étant la province la mieux dotée au point de vue économique et politique, elle peut jouer un rôle de médiateur dans le rapprochement des différentes régions.

Grâce à la présence d'un demi-million de francophones et aux liens importants avec le Québec au plan géographique, linguistique et des affaires, l'Ontario est bien placé pour expliquer la réalité québécoise au reste du pays.

Étant la province la plus peuplée, au-delà de neuf millions et la mieux représentée à la 34^e Législature — on dit que 99 membres sont dans l'Ontario — l'Ontario peut exercer son pouvoir afin de garantir et faire respecter les droits et libertés accordés aux femmes, afin d'assurer l'égalité entre hommes et femmes et d'implanter la dualité linguistique dans le pays.

Nous reconnaissons les efforts déployés par le gouvernement de l'Ontario et par nos communautés afin que les franco-Ontariens se sentent impliqués.

Ces efforts doivent cependant être suivis. Par conséquent, nous recommandons : que l'Ontario reconnaisse et reflète la dualité linguistique de la province et du pays ; que lors de la création de nouvelles institutions politiques, juridiques ou autres, l'égalité de la représentation des femmes et des hommes francophones au palier décisionnel soit prévue. De plus, la province doit impliquer davantage les régions dans l'élaboration de politiques sociale, économique et culturelle ; que l'Ontario joue un rôle primordial au niveau provincial en incorporant soit dans le code provincial (droits de la personne) ou par loi entièrement séparée, les droits parallèles à ceux garantis par la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés ; que lors de la formulation de politiques, l'Ontario tienne compte des acquis des femmes et étudie tout changement à la lumière de leur impact sur les droits des femmes.

Permettez-moi de conclure. «Il est plus que temps de revoir nos mœurs et de rechercher de nouveaux modèles de vie en société plus fondés sur la coopération que sur la concurrence, sur le respect des différences que sur l'uniformisation, sur le partage que sur la réussite personnelle».

Mrs Y. O'Neill: If you have been watching the proceedings you have seen many outstanding francophone women presenting to us: those young women, the woman this morning, the very intelligent young woman in Hamilton, and many of the artful presentations—in fact, a presentation that was unique from the French-language principals of a certain region of the province, and one of them was a woman. But you bring a very strong point home, and I think you have done it very well. I would like to ask you whether you feel this process and this turning point is giving women the voice they need at this particular time.

Mme Millette: Je répondrais que c'est un bon commencement et nous espérons que nous aurons plus de chance dans l'avenir de pouvoir donner nos points de vue, que les décisions ne seront pas toujours prises seulement au niveau de la Législature mais que les décisions viendront

aussi de l'opinion des personnes dans la communauté, et surtout des femmes quand il s'agit de l'égalité.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: My same hope.

M. Winninger: Il y a certains qui pensent que si le Québec est désigné comme une société distincte il y a des implications pour les femmes. Avez-vous pensé à ce sujet ?

1210

Mme Millette: Disons que dans l'égalité pour les femmes, les Québécois sont un peu en avant de nous parce qu'eux n'ont pas à se battre pour avoir des droits en français. Nous dépensons beaucoup d'énergie pour faire reconnaître nos droits, premièrement notre langue, ce qui veut dire que parfois nous sommes un peu en retard sur nos revendications au point de vue l'égalité pour les femmes. Mais nous gardons toujours l'oeil ouvert sur ce qui se passe au Québec. Et puis on peut s'assurer que, peu importe la décision que le Québec prendra, nous allons continuer quand même à défendre nos droits comme femmes et comme femmes francophones.

M. Winninger: Alors, à votre avis il n'y a pas une opposition entre les droits de femmes et la société distincte.

Mme Millette: Disons qu'on ne s'est pas arrêté encore parce qu'on attend le moment où ils seront plus certains de ce qu'ils veulent exactement. Il y a aujourd'hui beaucoup de pourparlers, un groupe veut une chose, l'autre une autre chose, alors quand ils diront qu'ils auront pris leur décision nous verrons exactement ce qu'on devra faire. C'est à ce moment-là qu'on prendra une décision.

M. McGuinty: J'ai écouté votre présentation ce matin. Vous n'avez pas donné votre opinion sur le bilinguisme officiel ici en Ontario.

Mme Millette: Disons que nous l'avons donnée un peu voilée.

M. McGuinty: Est-ce que vous pourriez en discuter un peu plus, s'il vous plaît, en considérant le contexte du grand débat national sur notre constitution qui prend place maintenant ?

Mme Millette: Notre opinion serait que l'Ontario se déclare bilingue ; que les francophones aient autant de chance que les anglophones peu importe où ils sont dans la province, dans le pays. Quand nous portons le nom d'une association comme canadienne-française, c'est que nos aspirations vont plus loin que seulement notre communauté, plus loin que notre province. Pour nous c'est tout un pays quand nous parlons de francophones.

Aujourd'hui on a parlé surtout des femmes francophones en Ontario, mais disons qu'on est bien sensibilisé aux besoins de toutes les femmes du pays francophone. Et le bilinguisme c'est une chose importante aussi pour nous. Nous avons une optique qui est peut-être un peu voilée mais demande de bien reconnaître la dualité linguistique dans la province comme c'est reconnu au niveau du Canada. Je pense que ça veut dire le bilinguisme.

M. le Président: Merci, madame.

FÉDÉRATION DES ÉLÈVES DU SECONDAIRE FRANCO-ONTARIEN

M. le Président : La Fédération des élèves du Secondaire franco-ontarien, FESFO.

M. Groulx : Bonjour, nous nous présentons, nous sommes la FESFO, un organisme qui se nomme la Fédération des élèves du Secondaire franco-ontarien. Nous sommes ici aujourd'hui en représentant nos 25 000 membres soit près de 70 écoles secondaires françaises ou mixtes de la province de l'Ontario. Nous vous remercions pour l'occasion de nous présenter ici aujourd'hui et pour commencer nous aimerions vous présenter quelque chose qui est représentatif des 400 élèves qui ont contribué lors des participations de nos forums «Organisation» régionaux, soit quatre dans la province. Chacun a fait sa part, alors on présente ça immédiatement.

Mlle Bigras : Pour commencer, le gouvernement de l'Ontario doit donner un modèle exemplaire pour le reste du Canada. Comment ? En déclarant l'Ontario bilingue parce que le Canada est bilingue et les provinces devraient l'être également. Il faut absolument éviter qu'une autre situation semblable à celle de Sault-Sainte-Marie se répète et provoque à nouveau l'éclatement de la communauté. Yves Thériault, un élève de l'école secondaire Notre-Dame-des-Grands-Lacs à Sault-Sainte-Marie, nous fait part d'un témoignage. Il dit : «Je viens de Sault-Sainte-Marie. La résolution visant à proclamer la ville unilingue anglaise a beaucoup affecté notre ville. De plus en plus de gens quittent la ville pour s'établir ailleurs où des services en français sont offerts. Cette résolution a fait mal à notre ville». Le gouvernement de l'Ontario devrait donc corriger cette situation et poser des gestes concrets.

Le gouvernement de l'Ontario a reconnu l'apport des francophones comme peuple fondateur et doit démontrer de façon claire et non équivoque sa position face au bilinguisme officiel dans sa province. En déclarant l'Ontario bilingue, les francophones vont pouvoir avoir des privilèges et des droits comme les anglophones partout au pays. Il devrait avoir des services en français, des institutions homogènes de langue française, un réseau de communication qui répond aux besoins des francophones dans toutes les régions. La loi sur les services ne doit pas seulement répondre aux besoins dans les endroits où le nombre le justifie. Il doit faire comprendre au Québec qu'il existe des francophones hors Québec et que l'Ontario constitue la deuxième province où le taux de francophones est le plus élevé après le Québec.

Au Nouveau-Brunswick, c'est dans l'esprit des gens que tout le monde est bilingue. Il y a beaucoup moins d'animosité entre francophones et anglophones. Être bilingue, ça développe l'esprit intellectuel, parce que sur le plan économique, l'Ontario n'aura qu'à investir une somme minime par rapport à l'ensemble de son budget annuel global pour devenir bilingue ; parce que le bilinguisme est une question de changement d'attitude — au début le changement fait peur mais après un bout de temps parler dans les deux langues deviendra un geste naturel ; enfin, parce qu'en tant que communauté civilisée on devrait pouvoir se regarder dans les yeux et se parler.

Mlle Fortier : Une deuxième question qu'on se pose c'est le système d'éducation qui répond aux besoins des francophones. Premièrement, il nous faut des livres en français. Souvent nous avons soit des manuels mal traduits, soit des manuels qui nous proviennent du Québec soit des manuels anglophones. Nous voulons des textes et des ressources pédagogiques qui viennent de chez nous et au même coût de celles que nous avons déjà. Pourquoi ? Afin d'apprendre nos valeurs et nos intérêts culturels et de développer notre sentiment d'appartenance.

Par exemple, Marisha Ben-Tchavtchavadze de l'école secondaire Étienne-Brûlé à Toronto nous dit : «Notre professeur de science de la société utilise des manuels écrits en anglais puisqu'ils sont récents et que les manuels français datent de dix ans». Kristine Lépine de l'école secondaire de London Central nous dit : «Pour avoir une bonne éducation en français, nous avons besoin des ressources supplémentaires». Enfin, Bernadette Dubreque de l'école secondaire Paincourt à Paincourt nous dit : «Pourriez-vous s'il vous plaît nous produire des textes en français, c'est pas très commode de toujours être obligé de se référer à des textes en anglais».

Deuxièmement, il nous faut des écoles. La situation aujourd'hui : nous partageons nos édifices scolaires avec les anglophones, nous préférierions avoir la cohabitation avec les francophones des conseils publics et catholiques. Pourquoi ? Ceci crée un milieu de vie francophone, développe l'homogénéité et encourage un esprit culturel. Par exemple, à l'école secondaire Marie-Rivier de Kingston composée de six portatives jointes par un corridor, il n'y a pas de gymnase, il n'y a pas de cafétéria, il n'y a pas de bibliothèque ni de salle de toilettes. Les élèves doivent se rendre à l'école secondaire anglophone au besoin. À Cochran nous avons besoin d'une école. Cela fait des années que nous partageons l'école avec les anglophones.

Troisièmement, il nous faut nos propres conseils scolaires de langue française. Pourquoi ? Donner aux francophones le pouvoir dans leurs écoles et ils/elles pourront alors répondre aux besoins des francophones.

Quatrièmement, il nous faut plus de cours d'intérêt et pas seulement les cours de base afin de permettre à l'élève de recevoir la même qualité d'enseignement que dans une grosse école anglaise.

Cinquièmement, il faut ajuster les critères du ministère en fonction du contenu des programmes d'enseignement afin de répondre aux besoins particuliers des francophones.

Sixièmement, il nous faut une politique concernant l'animation culturelle dans les écoles partout dans la province afin de répondre à cet urgent besoin.

1220

Mlle Mitchell : Je vais vous parler du milieu de vie francophone. Il faut que les opinions des élèves soient entendues aujourd'hui. Il faut créer un réseau de consultation auprès des élèves du secondaire et puis il faut créer un milieu communautaire francophone qui dépasse la cour d'école. J'ai une citation qui vient de quelques élèves de l'école secondaire de Plantagenet, à Plantagenet.

«Veuillez s'il vous plaît prendre en considération nos nombreuses demandes, nous en avons grandement besoin», et puis j'ai quelques citations qui viennent des milliers d'élèves du secondaire franco-ontarien : «Saviez-vous que... Nous avons droit.... J pense que c'est le temps.... Écoutez-nous.... En tant qu'élève du secondaire je pense que.... J'aimerais que.... Pourriez-vous s'il vous plaît.... J'ai quelque chose à vous dire....»

Ensuite, il faut développer le sens de leadership chez les Franco-Ontariens, donc il faut avoir de la formation en leadership.

Fritz Larivière de l'école secondaire d'Algonquin nous dit : «Nous avons droit à une formation en leadership en français. Ces activités renforcent l'unité francophone en Ontario». Pourquoi? Pour qu'ils et elles puissent prendre leur place en Ontario et qu'ils puissent gérer leurs entreprises et leurs conseils scolaires de façon autonome plus tard.

Il faut aussi valoriser l'élève qui s'implique dans sa communauté et dans son école. Il faut trouver une façon de créditer l'implication des élèves à l'intérieur du curriculum scolaire et il faut tenir compte des besoins culturels et rendre les horaires des élèves plus flexibles, afin de leur permettre de s'impliquer sans qu'ils n'aient à subir les conséquences néfastes.

«C'est grâce en grande partie aux élèves motivés, aux élèves impliqués que les Franco-Ontariens se rallient. Dans plusieurs endroits de la province la communauté culturelle tourne autour de l'école.

«Réalisez-vous qu'en général un élève impliqué au conseil des élèves de son école consacre un minimum de 175 heures de travail au dévouement de l'école»? C'est Caroline Bisson de l'école secondaire De La Salle à Ottawa qui nous a dit ça.

«Les élèves travaillent très forts mais dû au manque de financement les activités parascolaires sont limitées. Ces activités sont indispensables dans la vie d'un élève du secondaire et surtout pour la vie francophone»; Nadine Martel de l'école secondaire Northern Collegiate and Vocational Institute, une école d'à peu près mille anglophones, une école mixte, et puis dans l'école il y a 70 francophones.

«Je pense qu'il est temps que l'Ontario français reconnaisse toutes les activités parascolaires et qu'on soit crédité pour nos efforts.»

M. Groulx : Si on regarde au point de vue des collèges et des universités franco-ontariennes. Tout d'abord, on aimerait vous remercier pour le nouveau collège de l'Est, la Cité collégiale. Je crois que c'est très bien pour les gens de l'Est, c'est privilégié, on s'en sert puis les résultats sont là. Ce collège promouvait la continuité de l'étude postsecondaire en français en Ontario. Ce que nous voulons c'est la continuité du projet à l'échelle provinciale. Ce que nous voulons comme tel c'est deux collèges francophones, un dans le nord et l'autre dans le sud de la province; aussi, la création d'une université franco-ontarienne répondant aux besoins des francophones partout dans la province.

Alors pourquoi? Si on regardait les raisons. On ne veut pas aller étudier au Québec. On veut rester dans notre province, on veut rester ici. On veut garder les Franco-

Ontariens chez nous. Offrons-leur la possibilité de vivre en français en Ontario.

Si une des richesses de cette province est le fait qu'elle soit composée de deux peuples fondateurs, il faut investir dans la culture franco-ontarienne afin qu'elle s'épanouisse pleinement. En créant des collèges et universités de langue française en Ontario, les jeunes Franco-Ontariens se sentiront valorisés dans ce qu'ils et elles font et pour ce qu'ils et elles sont. Ayant étudié au primaire et au secondaire en français, la suite logique est le postsecondaire en français. Le nombre d'étudiants francophones qui étudient présentement au postsecondaire est suffisant pour assurer une inscription comble dès la première année.

Voici quelques-unes des citations sur la lettre ici à M. Rae au sujet du postsecondaire franco-ontarien.

«Je demande une institution postsecondaire en français dans le Nord», dit Angèle Lapointe de l'école secondaire Hanmer.

«Je suis en douzième année et je veux étudier au collège mais je dois aller à Ottawa. S'il-vous-plaît, changez mon destin en approuvant le collège dans le Nord», de Stéphane Lecours de l'école secondaire de Hearst.

Si nous regardons ce que Chantal Barrette de l'école secondaire Rayside de Sudbury nous dit : «Nous autres dans le Nord on a besoin de toute l'aide qu'on peut avoir. Donnez-nous un collège».

Et de Guy Gagnier de l'école secondaire l'Essor à Windsor : «Je suis certain que si on ouvrait les portes d'une université française ou d'un collège francophone dans la région du sud de l'Ontario, un soupir de soulagement se ferait entendre de Windsor à Toronto en passant par Penetang, Welland et Hamilton etc».

S'il y avait des réseaux de collèges créés ou d'universités de langue française mises sur pied, nous pourrions regarder dans les résultats suivants : la formation de jeunes professionnels franco-ontariens ; le développement de l'économie et des personnes qualifiées francophones qui pourront répondre aux besoins régionaux ; les Franco-Ontariens restent donc en Ontario et dans leur région ; pour certaines personnes c'est la seule chance d'étudier au postsecondaire ; plus de personnes francophones qualifiées égale plus de services en français égale plus de personnes francophones qualifiées.

Nous aimerions vous remercier et vous dire que ce que nous vous avons apporté aujourd'hui, on demande au gouvernement en leur disant que c'est maintenant le temps de prendre action et de démontrer l'exemple au reste du Canada en se disant bilingue et en ne pas renonçant aux francophones.

M. le Président : Au nom du comité, merci bien de votre présentation et de la manière de laquelle vous nous avez présenté vos points de vue. Comme j'ai déjà dit, nous sommes toujours heureux d'écouter les jeunes de la province parce que nous trouvons que vous avez une manière d'arriver au point, comme vous avez dit, et c'est quelque chose qui va nous aider à arriver nous mêmes à nos conclusions. Je crois qu'il y a peut-être des questions.

M. Beer : Une question au sujet de l'université de langue française : pensez-vous que ce serait mieux de créer

une université et mettre tout les effectifs là pour vraiment avoir une bonne université, ou est-ce qu'il faut essayer d'avoir au moins deux ou trois ? Qu'est-ce-que vous pensez de cela ?

M. Groulx : Si je peux me permettre de répondre : on garde la possibilité d'une université de langue française en Ontario. D'après une recherche qui a été faite par l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, il y a un nombre suffisant d'étudiants au postsecondaire pour combler une inscription suffisante.

En ce qui concerne la diversité des endroits pour les universités, je crois qu'une solution simple à ce problème serait d'avoir un centre universitaire fixe à un endroit commun, disons à Toronto, par exemple, parce que c'est une région assez centrale. Avoir des campus dans des régions plus éloignées pour permettre aux élèves de ne pas voyager jusqu'à Toronto ou jusqu'à Ottawa ou jusqu'à Windsor, ceci éliminerait le fait d'être obligés de partir de leur région et de leur famille.

Lorsque les gens partent de leurs endroits, habituellement ils n'y retournent plus et l'économie dans ces parties de la région baisse. En ayant des campus ou des réseaux d'une université ou d'un collège, ce problème est dissout puis le fait de l'université de langue française est là mais à différents endroits.

CANADIAN ETHNOCULTURAL COUNCIL

The Chair: I now call Lewis Chan and Emilio Binavince from the Canadian Ethnocultural Council. Go ahead.

M. Chan : Bonjour, je m'appelle Lewis Chan ; je suis président du Conseil ethnoculturel du Canada. Avec moi est Emilio Binavince ; il est le conseiller honoré de notre conseil.

Tout en premier lieu, notre Conseil ethnoculturel est une coalition sans but lucratif. Nous faisons partie des 37 organismes ethnoculturels nationaux qui représentent eux-mêmes plus de 2000 organismes provinciaux et locaux partout au Canada. L'objectif primaire de notre conseil est de garantir l'égalité de chance, de droit et de dignité pour les minorités ethnoculturelles et pour tous les Canadiens.

I would like to advise this committee a little on the process we have taken to date. Our council has within the last several months organized meetings so that we have drawn on the expertise and consultation among many groups and individuals and scholars and academics to develop a constitutional position regarding national unity for the purposes of appearing before federal and provincial committees such as this one here. Our position has not been fully developed, but on a rush basis to prepare for this meeting we have prepared some written materials for your consideration.

1230

What I will try to do is limit my presentation to about 10 minutes because I understand we have approximately 20 minutes and then we can allow about 10 minutes for questions and answers.

If I can perhaps take you through our brief, the white copy which is here, the first two pages within the brief

sum up some of our main recommendations. They reply to some of the questions asked in the public discussion paper. Others we can perhaps deal with in the question and answer.

We have four or five principal recommendations. The first is that within the Canadian Constitution and as well other provincial constitutions or policy papers, what they should set out is clearly defining the nature of the Canadian population and some of the fundamental characteristics and values within that province or country.

Some of those would include things such as recognizing the diversity of Canada, or the province in this case, based on race, national or ethnic origin, culture and religion; also recognizing the linguistic duality, the two official languages of Canada; the role of the aboriginal people; the regional diversity within different parts of Canada and how they are distinct unto themselves; equality between men and women, and social equality and justice. We should have a clause within the province, the government of Ontario in this case, which would set out clearly the nature of our population and what are some of our values.

Some of those values would include things such as being an open and tolerant society where we can accommodate differences among each other and enshrining not only equality but, more important, equity, which is something I will discuss a bit later.

The second point is that our council believes that different provinces or areas within Canada should maintain some sort of economic and political unity. However, given the various tugs and pulls within the country right now, we also think we have to be realistic and look at the fact that we cannot keep people or provinces or regions in Canada against their will. So ultimately it is the people of Canada, or a region, who must decide for themselves.

The third point, which was mentioned in the first point partly, is that the multiculturalism or recognizing the diverse nature of the peoples should be included in the provincial charters, constitutions or laws, as may be applicable.

The fourth point is the matter of immigration, and I have had occasion to comment publicly to the economic council's recent report in this regard. It is recognizing that Canada's population and demography are changing and increasing, from mainly immigration, and the source of immigration, and the result is that Canada and Ontario are becoming more multicultural and multiracial. There should be sufficient public education, because if government does, and I believe it does, support immigration, there needs to be more public education to inform the general public as to the benefits of increased immigration and how society would better adapt to new and greater sources of immigrants.

That outlines our brief briefly. Perhaps at this point I would just be ready to respond to questions myself, and Mr Binavince.

The Chair: Before I call on questions, I do not think we have received a copy of the brief, so if you have one you can leave with us—

Mr Chan: Oh, okay. I passed it to—

Mr Beer: Tony, we have. You are only the chairman.

The Chair: We do have it? Okay. Perhaps I just do not have a copy. That is fine. Then we will get a copy for those of us who do not have one. Why do we not just try to go around. We will start with Mr Bisson.

Mr Bisson: You mentioned something in your brief that I think about everybody has touched on, the whole question of the importance of our education system responding to the realities of the country in regard to multiculturalism, multiracial issues. Can you share with us what way you would see that developing? Like, what is actually needed within the education system in order to be able to deliver those kinds of programs and how do you think it should be done, in your view?

Mr Chan: Well, within the programs, education being mainly a provincial concern, although some part of it is federal, we have several concerns. One of them is as to the materials themselves, whether materials accurately reflect the history of Canada, first of all, including the aboriginal people and the various makeup of Canada.

One of the notions which our council does not subscribe to is the fact that there are two founding nations. We are of a view that Canada is comprised of many, many people who have been in Canada for a long time, including the aboriginals, of course the original French settlers and the British settlers, but also there have been for example people of German background, of Chinese background, etc, who were here well before Confederation. So a more accurate reflection of the history of Canada.

Another thing is to have materials which respect more the values of different people in Canada, as well. Within the school curriculum we do support for example teaching of languages other than English and French, because one of the things we recognize, which is one of the questions in the brief as to how we can make Canada more competitive internationally, is that we believe we can utilize people within Canada who have some capability in international languages or heritage languages so that we can compete in an international market and use those resources.

Mr Binavince: We take the position that education is a method of transmitting one's culture and one's knowledge to future generations. That generation is the one that will make this nation after we have gone and made our day. Presumably if we have a multicultural country, it has to transmit to future generations those traditions that reflect multiculturalism.

The other aspect, of course, of education is that it has to maintain the standard of living and the kind of country we want to have. It is not very simply being educated and that is the end of the day. It has to produce some economic benefits for the country. It has to bring civilization forward. And we have to go, as Mr Chan said, and face the competitive nature of the society outside of us. Toleration is one element of that kind of education and responsiveness to international challenge is the other side of it.

1240

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You do seem to have a very large group of people that you are representing this morning. You talked about a formal manner in which you gathered

the comments you have presented and I wondered if you had used our document, Changing for the Better, as part of that gathering of data. Have you used the document that this committee had circulated before we began?

Mr Chan: I am sorry. Are you referring to this discussion paper?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes.

Mr Chan: Yes, we have taken into consideration the questions being posed in this questionnaire as well.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Are your priorities listed in their order, the Canada clause being your first priority?

Mr Chan: Yes, that is correct.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Would you like to say a little bit more about that particular recommendation? We have had quite a few multicultural groups bring that to us. It may be a difficult achievement, but we certainly feel that we would like to learn as much about it from those who are recommending it as possible, so I would like you to say a little bit more about that.

Mr Chan: All right. Perhaps I can expand on that briefly. We had made presentations previously on constitutional matters, before the joint Senate and Commons committee on what is commonly referred to as Meech Lake, as well as various other committees dealing with the matter. Our council is on record as supporting the official languages and other aspects which we consider distinct or fundamental to Canada, but what we would like to see is that in describing Canada we embody the various things which are distinct or unique to Canada and which describe Canada and its peoples. They would include the official languages, certain regions being distinct, whether it be Quebec or others, the multicultural diversity within Canada and the recognition of the aboriginal peoples. Specifically with regard to multiculturalism, there is federal legislation already which was passed unanimously by the House of Commons in 1988 which describes multiculturalism as being a fundamental characteristic of Canada. So really it is nothing new, but what we would like to see is that embodied in the Constitution as well.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for helping us understand your first recommendation.

Mr G. Wilson: I realize that this is just the summary of your recommendations, you elaborate it more fully in your paper which I have not had a chance to read in detail, but I am interested if you could elaborate for us what you call the misunderstanding. I guess, by many Canadians about what multiculturalism is all about and the failure of political leaders to bring some understanding in these areas.

Mr Chan: As I mentioned earlier on, this is a fairly rushed presentation put together, but in my view multiculturalism, which is a policy which has been with us for approximately 17 years or 18 years or so—in fact multiculturalism is a reality. We only need to look in different parts of Canada to realize that Canada is very diverse. So the fact that Canada is a multicultural nation came about before that policy came into being. The policy was only a recognition of that fact.

I think what a misinterpretation of multiculturalism—and in that case it is the fault, I believe, of maybe society as a whole, you know, whether it is government, whether it is community people, whether it is the media. I think we all have to bear some responsibility. But coming back to multiculturalism, it is a philosophy ultimately which says that all people in Canada are equals, regardless, and should be treated as having equal rights and access and so, regardless of their backgrounds, whether it be linguistic or cultural or racial or religious or whatever. It goes beyond just being a policy for minority groups. It is a policy which should embody all Canadians.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentations.

Mr Chan: Thank you.

COALITION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE FOR URBAN NATIVES

The Chair: I call Gordon George from the Coalition for the Preservation of Aboriginal Languages for Urban Natives.

Mr George: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman, distinguished committee, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, before I get into this, may I apologize for the typing errors, as I had to redo this three or four times yesterday and attend a conference as well. I had to do this rather quickly, so I apologize for any typing errors.

My name is Gordon George and I am pleased to be able to come before you and do thank you for this time given to me.

I was in my office, and on my desk there is a calendar with all the holidays people celebrate. I did not see one for native people—not one. I guess we do not have anything to celebrate.

We find ourselves now in a situation where, as aboriginal people of Canada, many, many items that should have been resolved upon early contact still are not resolved. I guess the most depressing thing about these items is not that they really exist or still exist; it is that we still will not address these items.

So rather than spending a lot of time celebrating—and yes, we do have a lot of things to celebrate. We have probably living within the borders of Canada some of the most generous people in the world. We have an incredible, resourceful country. For the land mass, we have probably proportionately, on a per capita basis, more land, more resources than any other people in the world, but the way we have been managing them over the past 125 years I do not think has been in its best interest.

But when we look at the relationship that exists between the aboriginal people and the people who have come here since Columbus stumbled on this land, we find that for native people our lives have gone down the drain. The environment has virtually gone down the drain.

We have an enormous task, as native people, to get any single item resolved, and the first problem we run into is that we do not know our common history. If there was a single item that I would like to get from this event it would be to have an accurate reflection of our joint history.

I think that there is nothing more appalling than the fact that most people who are educated in Canada, be they native or non-native, never get a fair understanding of how the land was acquired. In fact most Canadians, because we are so entertained by our Americans to the south of us, think that the same thing happened here, that the cavalry charged over the hills and native people were defeated. That did not happen here. The history of our people must be told. We need to accurately present what has happened in the past so that we may deal with it in the future. We need to begin to deal with some amazing inadequacies.

I do not feel proud that there are some ranches in Canada that are bigger than 10 or 15 reserves, do you? Do you feel proud about that?

I do not feel good about the fact that native people can have lived on this land for thousands of years and yet they do not have any legal, recognized aboriginal title to this land. At the same time, we are telling the world that at many times in our history in the past 125 years, farmers could come and stake out land and all they had to do was cut a few trees and run a few furrows in the land and it belonged to them.

What are we going to celebrate? Are we going to celebrate the fact that it took until 1959 before we could vote in this country? Are we going to celebrate the fact that it took until 1968 before we could vote in Quebec? What are we going to celebrate?

1250

I do not like what has happened in the last 500 years. We could not do a lot about it. The majority of people could not do a lot about it. But what are we going to do about the next 500 years? What are we going to do about the next nine years so that when the year 2000 comes around, there are some differences? What are we going to do about the poverty of native people? We do not like it when Canadians are unemployed. We are concerned when we are around 10% and more, and we are concerned when a million people are unemployed. But what if 90% of your people are out of work?

I do not think we have a single thing to celebrate unless we are going to do some work, unless we are going to do something different in the future. Yes, the French and English should sit down and talk among themselves. That is an interesting debate. We as native people watch it all the time. I hear this talk about minority language, and I think, are they possibly talking about the indigenous language? Not once when that is discussed, are we talking about indigenous language.

I hear this talk of separation, where someone is going to physically take land away from Canada. What land? What about the indigenous land in Quebec? What about the indigenous people at Barrier Lake who do not have a treaty? That land has never been dealt with and the people who are there are still trying to scratch out a living like they did in the past. What land are they going to take?

The Canadian experience for indigenous people is to watch these two peoples that have come after us argue among themselves over our land, over our resources, and what we have is misery and poverty. We are marginalized.

What about the 53 indigenous languages that we have lost? How many more will be lost in the next few years? It is really time for a change. It is time that the European people and their descendants and the rest that are here that are now Canadians seriously begin to address the basic relationship we have with this land and the people that were here first. We can do things differently in this country. We can be leaders for the world. We criticize South African for the racism that is seen there, yet we have no examples at home.

The problem in South Africa is descendants of European people trying to wrestle with the fact that they must live with an indigenous people. In that case, the indigenous people are the majority, so there is paranoia in that white race that is there. But what is your paranoia? Why can we not have a situation here where native people have enough and enough control over their lives where they can have some dignity? We have no reason to criticize South Africa. We have no examples to show the world.

But it can be different and it must be different, or the next couple of decades will not be the French and English problem. We cannot have a situation where people are lined up to get to the negotiating table and maybe in 30 years, maybe in 40 years they will begin to negotiate. You cannot continue to contain that situation. What we have now in the way land is being dealt with in this country, we have treaties that are hundreds of years old and that are supposedly protected by the highest law in Canada, the Constitution. Yet, 100 years later, we still have not fulfilled the land requirements in that legal constitutional document.

Can you think of any other people among us that would have that kind of legal document and 100 years later still be wondering whether we should fulfil that legal document? It can only happen to native people; it would never happen to the Anglos. The time has come, and thank God that they have the power now. It would never happen to the French. But that is not good enough. That is not all that is here.

It was an insult to the first nations when the premiers and the Prime Minister of this country could come out of a room that they were locked into well after midnight and announce to the world that there were two founding peoples, two distinct societies. My God, these men were the same men whom George Erasmus and the Assembly of First Nations had been negotiating with for the past five years, yet they had the audacity or the ignorance to come out of there and not recognize the fact that Canada and somewhere else in the world do the indigenous peoples from here call home. If we are not distinct here, where in the hell are we distinct?

When is it going to be different? When are we celebrating 1,000 years? Or are we hoping that by that time all 53 indigenous languages do not exist any more? Are we hoping that by that time we have become so much of the melting pot that we have become completely irrelevant?

I believe we can do something different. We want to do something different. We are sick and tired of coming to events like this and being your conscience, absolutely sick and tired of it. We would like nothing better than to go

around and feel good about ourselves, but we have too many real things to be concerned about.

Do we want a bald place on earth where every tree is killed and never comes back? Do we want to live in a cesspool? Or do we want the next 125 years to turn around the clear-cut forest and the pollution from the mines? Do we want to be first in a few things, first in human relations? Canada has a lot of potential. The question is, are we big enough to face that challenge?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr George. Let me just say to you, on behalf of the committee, that the issues you have raised are ones that we have heard a great deal about over our hearings the last three weeks. It is an area that we as a committee take very seriously. Our point of departure is the position Ontario has taken, which is to work towards recognizing self-government for the native peoples and looking for ways to make those words and that concept into reality. We realize that there is a great deal of work to be done and we realize that in the end it will be acts and not words that will be the significant determination of that concern. I did want to say to you that we have heard the message very clearly in the hearings to date, and you have underlined it again for us today.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much for your presentation. Along the same lines as Mr Silipo has just mentioned, what I have found interesting, wherever we went, to the north and now to the south, is that almost without exception, every non-native person who has got up to speak to us has been very, very supportive of aboriginal rights, negotiating self-government, all kinds of things, contrary to the split in how people feel about French-English relations.

I am wondering if that is a new phenomenon. Do you think that people are finally getting the message? Do you think that because of Oka and because of leaders like yourself, that ordinary people in Ontario and maybe all of Canada are finally starting to understand and are really supportive? Or do you think that some of it is lipservice because people are not really clear on the implications of solving these problems?

Mr George: That is a very interesting question. I myself attend a lot of aboriginal conferences. The last one I attended was in Peterborough, where we had a youth and elders conference. The most gratifying thing for me at these conferences—as I said before, I do not wish to labour the point, but the most gratifying thing for me is that non-natives attending these conferences come away from there with a feeling within themselves that they have never had before. It is like something they have lost. They have an inner feeling and they express that to us so many times.

We as native people know our relationship with the land, but non-natives who come and see us in our dances and our drumming, in our costumes, in our culture, have such a gratifying feeling within themselves that they come away from there—and I mean this sincerely—sometimes virtually in tears.

This is so gratifying for me, because now we know that people are sincere. People are very sincere about the environment. People are very sincere about native people and the relationship that we have about this land. We are first

Ojibways, Crees, Micmacs, and Canadians next, because this Canada grew up around us. We do not want to lose that culture. We do not want to lose this feeling that we have with the land. It is such a good feeling that we have within ourselves.

So, yes, it is very gratifying, especially for non-natives, to come to these conferences and come away from there with such a feeling that is so good within themselves that, again, I say they are sometimes virtually in tears.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much.

1300

FACULTÉ DE DROIT
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA

The Chair: I call next Marc Cousineau.

M. Cousineau : Premièrement, laissez-moi vous remercier de nous permettre de vous adresser la parole aujourd'hui et de présenter mes collègues. Mon nom, en premier lieu, est Marc Cousineau. Je suis le doyen associé de la faculté de droit de l'Université d'Ottawa, section common law et responsable en partie du programme français. À ma gauche est la professeure Lucie Léger qui va aussi présenter devant vous, et à mon extrême gauche est la professeure Diane Labelle qui va aussi participer à cette présentation.

Laissez-moi en premier vous expliquer la raison pour laquelle nous croyons pouvoir contribuer à vos recherches et à vos études. Nous croyons que nous sommes dans une situation assez privilégiée quant aux droits de la personne. La faculté de droit de l'Université d'Ottawa représente les deux cultures et les deux systèmes juridiques de notre pays. Nous avons, dans la même faculté, la section de droit civil et la section de common law. Dans la section de common law, nous avons deux programmes complets : un programme en anglais et un programme en français. Nous participons au programme de common law en français.

De plus, nous avons à la faculté le Centre canadien des droits de la personne et nous sommes responsables de la revue juridique, *Les Femmes et le droit*. Alors, dire que nous vivons les droits de la personne, c'est une vérité. Chaque décision que nous prenons à notre faculté — du moins nous tentons de prendre une décision en vertu des droits de tous les individus et des communautés de notre société.

L'autre élément important qui nous permet, nous croyons, de nous présenter devant vous c'est que notre programme est un programme d'action positive. Puisque nous sommes devant vous, c'est pour témoigner de l'utilité de tels programmes et le succès de notre programme démontre que c'est une méthode très facile pour revendiquer les droits des minorités au travers le Canada.

Un exemple du succès de notre programme : lorsque notre programme a été créé il y a seulement quelques années, on n'a même pas mis de nombres maximaux aux personnes qui pouvaient être inscrites au programme parce qu'on ne croyait pas que la demande pouvait y être. Il y a quelques années, on a dû mettre un nombre maximum de 60 personnes à notre programme parce que la demande était tellement grande. Les programmes d'action positive nous invitent en premier lieu à créer les programmes,

ensuite les demandes vont venir. On ne peut jamais s'attendre à avoir les demandes en premier lieu avant de créer les programmes.

Vous avez le mandat de notre programme à la page 2 de notre mémoire. La common law française ne s'enseigne que dans deux écoles dans le monde entier : à Moncton et à l'Université d'Ottawa. La seule raison pour laquelle la common law s'enseigne en français dans notre pays est la cause des minorités francophones qui existent à l'extérieur du Québec. Évidemment, au Québec c'est le système de droit civil. On n'a pas besoin d'avoir la common law en français. C'est seulement dans les provinces de common law au Canada qu'on utilise la common law en français.

Nous vivons, à la faculté, la raison d'être de la common law en français, c'est-à-dire les communautés francophones hors Québec. Nous croyons pour cette raison aussi avoir des motifs importants de présenter devant vous.

Avant de céder la parole à ma collègue la professeure Léger, je voudrais reprendre quelque chose qu'on a entendu ce matin de la Fédération des élèves du Secondaire francontarien au sujet des textes en français. La common law a une grande tradition britannique. Nous enseignons et nous devons traduire tout. Nos étudiants et étudiantes qui étudient chez nous doivent faire toute la lecture en anglais parce qu'il n'y a pas de textes de common law en français. Il n'y en a jamais eu de besoin dans l'histoire. Nous avons fait des demandes, par l'entremise de l'université, au gouvernement de l'Ontario à plusieurs reprises pour de l'argent pour nous aider à développer des textes en français et nous avons toujours été refusés. Alors, je ne voulais pas manquer l'occasion de le faire d'une façon un peu plus formelle ici devant vous et la prochaine fois nous faire accueillir de façon favorable.

J'aimerais céder la parole maintenant à la professeure Léger.

Mlle Léger : La société ontarienne moderne exprime une volonté de se fonder sur des principes des droits de la personne et plus précisément, le principe de l'égalité. Ce principe a déjà été reconnu, par exemple, dans la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés ainsi que dans le Code des droits de la personne de l'Ontario qui exigent que chaque individu ou chaque et chacune des collectivités soit traité avec respect et dignité.

D'ailleurs, dans plusieurs de ces décisions, la Cour suprême du Canada a déjà traité du principe de l'égalité en terme de respect et de dignité, ce qui veut dire qu'il faut s'éloigner d'une définition formelle de l'égalité. Il y a bien des exemples qui peuvent nous éclairer là-dessus. L'égalité des femmes ne se fait pas en les traitant comme des hommes. Si c'était le cas, les congés de maternité n'existeraient pas, par exemple ; même chose, je pense, pour les collectivités. Le discours éloquent de M. George qui nous a précédé vous a sans doute convaincus que ce dont ont besoin les peuples autochtones n'est pas nécessairement la même chose que ce dont a besoin chacune des collectivités qui composent le Canada. Donc, l'égalité ne peut pas se faire de façon formelle, elle doit partir d'une notion de respect et de dignité.

Lorsque la collectivité en question est dans une situation vulnérable, il incombe au gouvernement de prendre des

mesures pour assurer la survie et les intérêts de ses minorités. Le préambule de la Loi de 1986 sur les services en français affirme que la collectivité franco-ontarienne a joué en Ontario un rôle historique et honorable. Malheureusement, cette communauté-là continue à être la cible d'attaques par les membres de la collectivité majoritaire, tel que démontré par des événements récents que vous connaissez tous et toutes : les décisions des municipalités de Thunder Bay et de Sault-Sainte-Marie de se déclarer unilingues, l'incident à Brockville, la popularité du parti COR, par exemple. Nous ne pouvons croire autrement que ces manifestations ont du racisme. Ces événements sont du racisme dont la seule source est le mépris et la haine pour la collectivité francophone.

D'autres raisons importantes incitent les gouvernements à s'empressement de prendre des mesures positives pour le bénéfice de la collectivité francophone. Par le passé, le gouvernement de l'Ontario a agi délibérément pour supprimer les droits des francophones. Mentionnons simplement le Règlement 17 de 1912 qui avait pour effet de supprimer l'enseignement de la langue française dans les écoles ontariennes, et qui limitait finalement tout enseignement possible à une heure par jour. Alors, puisque le gouvernement de l'Ontario est en grande partie responsable de l'affaiblissement de la communauté franco-ontarienne, nous pensons que à aussi le gouvernement doit être responsable pour les réparations qui sont dues à la communauté franco-ontarienne.

De ce point de vue-là, nous ne considérons pas que les arguments fondés sur le fardeau économique de ces mesures positives sont valables. La Cour suprême du Canada a toujours accepté le principe que l'égalité et les principes fondamentaux de notre société passent avant les fardeaux économiques et nous pensons que le gouvernement de l'Ontario est en mesure de poursuivre cet engagement.

En dernier lieu, il faudrait mentionner le fait que la collectivité franco-ontarienne existe en soi, est une communauté en soi et ne dépend pas de l'adhésion ni de la séparation de la province du Québec du reste du Canada. Nous reconnaissons que la séparation du Québec pourrait avoir des conséquences des plus sérieuses et sans doute néfastes pour les francophones de l'Ontario. Mais c'est l'ailleurs pour cette raison que nous vous demandons d'agir dès maintenant pour assurer la survie et l'épanouissement de la collectivité francophone ontarienne. Notre intervention vise à promouvoir les intérêts d'une communauté qui est riche, qui est dynamique et qui risque d'essuyer un recul considérable si la conjoncture actuelle se poursuivait dans le contexte d'une séparation du Québec.

310

L'État, nous pensons, s'exprime par ses institutions et une collectivité s'épanouit à l'intérieur de ces institutions. Nous participons à deux grandes institutions étatiques, notamment en tant que professeurs au système d'éducation et en tant que juristes, au système juridique et nous avons à ce niveau-là des propositions précises que nous voudrions présenter à votre comité.

Mlle Labelle : Je suis ici pour vous parler du système d'éducation. Vous avez déjà entendu parler du Règlement 17 à plusieurs reprises aujourd'hui. Et bien voilà, son

effet a été de priver la communauté francophone pendant une période de 60 ans de l'enseignement dans sa langue maternelle. Pendant cette période, la communauté francophone s'est vue dévalorisée. Elle s'est dit : « Il n'y a pas de place pour le français dans l'Ontario ». Alors, quel est l'effet d'une telle dévalorisation ? D'abord, il y a l'assimilation. Si nous ne pouvons y participer puisque nous sommes francophones, nous allons alors devenir anglophones. Deuxième effet possible c'est, à ce moment-là, qu'on retient son identité francophone mais qu'on participe de façon limitée à la collectivité majoritaire, c'est-à-dire qu'on restreint ses activités où on se retrouve comme francophone et donc qu'on ne contribue pas pleinement.

Vous avez également entendu les étudiants et les étudiantes venir vous demander un système scolaire complet. Je suis ici pour vous dire que le gouvernement de l'Ontario a non seulement l'obligation morale, mais l'obligation juridique de fournir un système scolaire complet. La promotion et la préservation d'une culture et d'une langue ne peuvent se réaliser qu'à l'intérieur d'un système d'éducation qui réunit tous les éléments nécessaires.

La Cour suprême du Canada l'a affirmé dans l'affaire Mahé. La Cour nous dit qu'il existe un lien étroit entre la culture, la langue et l'éducation et je crois que la présentation des peuples autochtones viennent confirmer cet élément également. La Cour ajoute que l'article 23 de la Charte — c'est l'article qui garantit l'enseignement dans la langue de la minorité — a un objet réparateur.

Nous jugeons qu'afin de respecter cet article, le gouvernement de l'Ontario doit mettre sur pied un système d'éducation global destiné aux francophones de la maternelle à l'université en passant de la garderie à l'éducation permanente. De plus, suite à la décision de la Cour d'appel de l'Ontario dans le renvoi sur la Loi sur l'éducation, le gouvernement doit repenser sa carte scolaire de sorte à assurer aux francophones leur propre système scolaire. Ici nous parlons de repenser ce que nous connaissons comme des commissions scolaires. Par exemple, la région du moyen-nord, composée de Sudbury, Sturgeon Falls, North Bay et les municipalités environnantes pourrait facilement être constituée en un conseil scolaire francophone autonome.

Lorsqu'on examine les nombres suffisants pour établir un tel conseil, il n'est pas raisonnable de se limiter aux lignes et aux frontières déjà tracées. On doit examiner la réalité telle que la vit la minorité.

Nous tenons à souligner notre appui à la création de nouveaux collèges communautaires francophones comme on l'a revendiqué encore ce matin. Par définition, un collège communautaire existe au sein d'une communauté. Donc, bien que la Cité collégiale répond aux besoins de la communauté francophone de l'Outaouais, celle-ci ne saura répondre aux besoins des francophones du nord, du moyen-nord et du sud de la province.

Et en plus de créer de nouveaux collèges communautaires, nous demandons la fondation d'une université de langue française qui offrirait une échelle complète de programmes. C'est le moins qu'exige l'esprit réparateur de l'article 23 de la Charte. L'article 23 de la Charte force les gouvernements à reconnaître les injustices dont ont été victimes les francophones de l'Ontario.

Pour ma part, j'aimerais vous faire un témoignage personnel. Je suis originaire d'un petit village à l'extérieur de Sudbury. Vous avez entendu parler de Hamner lorsque les étudiants se sont présentés ; c'est mon lieu d'origine. J'ai été instruite dans la langue française pendant l'école primaire et ensuite mon secondaire a été dans une institution bilingue ; à l'époque, les écoles secondaires françaises n'existaient pas. Elles étaient à la veille d'être créées. Plus tard dans ma vie je me suis déplacée à Thunder Bay et là j'ai vécu en anglais et j'ai travaillé en anglais. C'est là où je me suis rendu compte qu'une culture et sa langue sont des choses très fragiles et qu'il est très facile d'y avoir érosion et ensuite assimilation.

Suite à mon vécu à Thunder Bay, je me suis déplacée pour vivre au Nouveau-Brunswick et c'est là où je me suis rendu compte qu'il est possible d'avoir un système d'éducation qui répond aux besoins des francophones bien qu'il y ait une majorité anglophone dans la province. C'est possible d'avoir ce système de dualité, si vous voulez. J'ai poursuivi des études au niveau universitaire à l'Université de Moncton.

Je suis maintenant professeure de droit et je contribue maintenant d'une façon, grâce à mon expérience enrichissante à l'Université de Moncton, à la société ontarienne comme je n'aurais pas pu le faire autrement. Je travaille à former des avocats et des avocates de langue française qui vont retourner dans leur milieu, nous espérons, pour oeuvrer aux besoins de leur communauté. Ces avocats et ces avocates contribuent également à la société dans son sens entier, c'est-à-dire qu'ils et elles vont aussi représenter des clients et des clientes de langue anglaise et d'autres minorités. Donc, dans ce sens je ne crois pas que j'aurais pu contribuer de façon aussi importante si je n'avais pas eu l'expérience d'une formation à l'université dans ma langue maternelle, soit le français.

Pour ce qui est des arguments d'ordre économique, je vous dis qu'à chaque fois que l'on empêche une minorité, que ce soit les francophones ou les peuples autochtones, de participer pleinement à la société, ce sont là les coûts économiques, ce sont là les pertes économiques. Bien qu'on doit encourir des coûts importants pour mettre en place un système tel que nous le demandons, je crois que la participation autrement perdue de ces personnes devient avantageuse et devient accentuée au point où les coûts économiques sont diminués dans le sens que maintenant on contribue à la société et on apporte beaucoup plus au roulement économique.

Je passe maintenant la parole à Marc Cousineau.

M. Cousineau : Merci. J'aimerais aborder avec vous maintenant quelques commentaires au niveau du système juridique. Le système juridique est une des grandes institutions de l'État, il n'y a pas de doute. Une communauté doit avoir accès au système juridique afin de participer pleinement à la société. Ce n'est que depuis 1980 que les francophones ont le droit d'utiliser leur langue devant les tribunaux de la province et en réalité ce n'est qu'avec les modifications en 1988 à la Loi de 1984 sur les tribunaux judiciaires que les francophones obtiennent un accès réel aux tribunaux.

Après tant d'années d'exclusion, les francophones doivent être renseignés sur leurs droits récemment reconnus. Un sondage de l'AJEFO, l'Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Ontario, en 1984 démontre que les francophones sont très réticents pour exiger leurs droits devant les tribunaux judiciaires et on se demande pourquoi. Deux raisons ressortent : premièrement, parce qu'ils ne sont pas renseignés de leurs droits d'utiliser le français ; deuxièmement, ce qui est encore plus choquant est qu'on a peur d'exiger le français dans un système qui est le leur, qui est le système des Anglais. Exiger nos droits en français est vu comme une façon de minimiser leurs chances de gagner.

1320

Les régistres des palais de justice nous disent que les francophones n'utilisent toujours pas leurs droits d'accès au système judiciaire. L'AJEFO est en train de mettre sur pied une campagne de sensibilisation. Cependant, on n'a pas de fonds. Sans cette campagne de sensibilisation, les droits à l'accès aux tribunaux judiciaires en français risquent de devenir purement illusoires et d'une valeur symbolique. Le financement d'une telle campagne doit venir de la province qui, en vertu de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1967, est responsable de l'administration de la justice dans la province.

De plus, l'AJEFO est une institution juridique essentielle à la collectivité francophone. On leur a coupé les fonds lors du dernier gouvernement. On est ici pour vous demander de réinstaurer les fonds pour assurer un financement permanent à cette association.

M. le Président : Si vous pouviez conclure rapidement.

M. Cousineau : Très rapidement, je vais conclure. Très brièvement, nous recommandons aussi, comme vous voyez à la fin, que la Loi de 1986 sur les services en français inclue un mécanisme de recours. Dans le moment il n'y en a pas. Si le gouvernement ou un de ces tribunaux refusent des services en français, il n'y a pas de recours dans la loi, alors c'est une des choses qu'on demande. On demande aussi que le Code des droits de la personne de l'Ontario soit modifié pour inclure la langue comme un des motifs de discrimination interdits. C'est frappant que le Code des droits de la personne inclut presque tous les autres motifs sauf la langue. On vous demande cette modification.

Finalement, nous vous demandons et nous voulons mettre beaucoup d'importance sur une déclaration de bilinguisme constitutionnel. L'imagine qu'on n'est pas le premier groupe à le faire, alors vous connaissez déjà plus les arguments. Laissons-nous souligner finalement que l'article 43 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1982 vous offre un mécanisme très facile pour rendre la province bilingue de façon constitutionnelle. Alors il n'y aurait pas de difficultés telles qu'on a vues avec l'accord du Lac Meech.

Pour conclure finalement, l'Ontario et le Canada sont au point de se définir. Les choses que nous vous demandons ici aujourd'hui, c'est vrai que nous le demandons pour la collectivité franco-ontarienne. Nous aussi voulons participer à cet acte de définition de l'Ontario. Pour reprendre la thèse du début de la professeure Léger : une

société se définit en vertu du traitement de ses minorités. Nous représentons une minorité. En nous accordant les droits que nous demandons, l'Ontario va se définir comme étant une société juste et saine.

CONSEIL DE PLANIFICATION SOCIALE
D'OTTAWA-CARLETON
SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL
OF OTTAWA-CARLETON

The Chair: Could I call next Mary Pat McKinnon from the Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton.

M. Melchers : No, I am not Mary Pat McKinnon. Je m'appelle Ronald Melchers ; je suis le président du Conseil de planification sociale d'Ottawa-Carleton. Pour économiser votre temps — j'entends des grondements de faim autour de la table — on va épargner un peu les préliminaires. Vous avez ici des députés de l'Assemblée législative qui sont élus dans notre région qui nous connaissent très bien et je les chargerai dans vos délibérations, vos rencontres, de nous présenter et vous dire un peu qui nous sommes.

Donc, je vais sauter directement à la raison qui nous amène ici à vous présenter ce mémoire. Nous représentons, en quelque sorte, la majorité de la population de l'Ontario qui, dans ce débat, est restée silencieuse sur plusieurs aspects. L'aspect qui nous préoccupe en tant que Conseil de planification sociale est les perspectives qui concernent la justice et l'équité.

The constitutional debates in this country and in this province, though they have been much briefer and much more superficial perhaps, have tended to concentrate on a certain number, and a very reduced number, of questions. The questions which interest us as a social planning council are perhaps different from those national questions. We are concerned with justice and with equity. We are concerned with social goals, and it has been our great dissatisfaction with the process that the social goals of our country and the social goals of our province have not received sufficient attention in the public deliberations on the current constitutional crisis and the constitutional future of Ontario.

We feel that beginning in about the mid-1970s there was a fundamental shift in the goals which were pursued by social and economic policies in this country. That shift occurred both at the federal level and at the provincial level. We have abandoned a number of goals which charted our course as we put together the links of the social safety net from about the 1940s or 1930s up until the mid-1970s.

We pursued a number of goals, not all of which were just social justice and equity. Many of them were economic efficiency goals. They were goals of economic growth. They were goals trying to establish an infrastructure from which Canada would be able to compete internationally, particularly in the restructured post-war economies of Europe and North America. Those goals have been abandoned and that has not been recognized and it is not being recognized currently.

We wonder how you can have a constitutional debate if there is no discussion of the fundamental goals which that Constitution is to help us achieve. This is why we are presenting to you.

We have a written brief, which has been distributed to you I believe through the clerk, which will give you much more detail and much more perspective on the kinds of groups we represent, the kinds of issues we want to bring in, but I did want to leave with you the major point. If we only can make one, I think that is the one that we want to leave you with.

I will ask Mary Pat McKinnon to highlight very briefly the kinds of things you will find in the brief as you read it.

Mrs McKinnon: When we were going through the exercise of doing this brief, we decided that what should drive the brief in a sense is what are common values we share as Canadians and as citizens of Ontario. So we went away and we came up with what we thought were some key values, the first of which is a belief in fairness and social justice. We thought this was a fundamental value we share as Canadians and that must be considered in any kind of discussions around constitutional reform.

A second value that we believe we share is a belief in fundamental freedoms and rights of all individuals. A third value is a belief in the value of linguistic and cultural diversity. A fourth value is a belief that the French and English traditions and cultures can coexist in harmony in this country. A fifth value is a tradition that seeks consensus and compromise rather than violence and extremism.

A sixth and final value for this brief—certainly these are not all the values we share as Canadians, but we thought that they were the key ones—is an appreciation of our natural environment. By that we mean concern around the environmental issues and concern around how our environment has had a peculiar effect on shaping our identity as Canadians.

We also turn to the question that the discussion paper raised, which is what is the role of Ontario in the present discussions? We believe that Ontario must take leadership, that historically it has always played a very important role in Confederation and that this role must continue. However, we recognize that that leadership role must be exercised with great caution, because Ontario cannot be perceived as dominating the debate or being arrogant in exercising that leadership role.

However, we do not believe that Ontario has to take a back seat, because in fact Ontario has been very generous in supporting the concept of equity and equalization which has been built into the Charter of Rights in our new Constitution. So Ontario in looking at its role has to acknowledge that its position in Confederation, by virtue of its economy and its population, is a key role and that that is not to be equated with arrogance. That is just to be equated with the reality of the facts.

I am not going to go through the more detailed discussion of how we see Ontario taking a role, but I just wanted to highlight that.

Then we looked at something that we thought was very important, that is, what role should the federal and provincial governments play? In this question, we thought that it is very important to step back a minute and to consider in this debate the division of constitutional powers and to note that the Constitution is really just a tool. It is more of a tool that assigns regulatory powers and instruments. It is

not a document that really defines the scope and range of service industries open to governments.

1330

We feel we have to go beyond the issue of which level has which powers and ask the questions: What is it that we want from our governments and what are our options in fulfilling these wants? In asking those questions we thought then we had to look at some key principles that should guide any discussion around constitutional alterations. These principles or assumptions, if you will, are the following:

A reasonably similar quality of life for all Canadians: If you consider the unequal distribution of resources and the unequal tax bases among the provinces, the federal government's role in providing equalization payments to provinces and in providing cash transfers to individuals and families, it is a critical role in maintaining a basic level of minimum standards. We worry that the level of social and health services in Canada, while far from optimum and admittedly in need of enriching, will be jeopardized if decentralization further erodes the federal government's fiscal and legislative powers.

Capacity to create and maintain national policy frameworks: We believe that the federal government must have sufficient control of fiscal and monetary policy instruments and enough financial resources to enable it to shape national policy frameworks. The policies and programs that emerge from these frameworks can then be jointly designed and implemented with the provincial and in some cases municipal governments, but the federal government has to maintain that kind of leverage.

Respect for an intact federal presence: By that what we mean is that, again, if you increase decentralization or if you erode more of the federal government's economic and revenue powers, it will make it very difficult, if not impossible, to develop and implement new national social programs.

Need for a national economic strategy: We believe that the federal government, again jointly with the provincial governments, has a responsibility, and I underline that, to develop national economic policy that is regionally non-discriminatory and reflects a willingness to intervene in the economy in pursuit of national social and economic objectives that otherwise would not be realized through the workings of the free market system.

Constitutional and political reforms are inevitable and necessary: Belief in a strong central government with a clear economic role in Canada in no way precludes a willingness to discuss different options for sharing jurisdictional powers and for reforming central institutions.

We looked at what the roles of the French and English languages were in Canada, and I must say that our brief reflects our vision of a country that includes Quebec. We approach the issue of official languages from that vantage point. We believe that Ontario must build on the French Language Services Act. It is not enough to simply have policies to promote linguistic equality or to guarantee a provincial administration offering services in both languages. Language must be used and lived if it is to flourish.

Francophone advocates of bilingualism are not lobbying for translation; they are lobbying for the right to be treated in their own reality. Therefore, we believe the government

of Ontario must undertake initiatives to promote the respect of both official language groups and self-determination among minority francophone groups in Ontario.

Finally, we believe that the political reality in Canada is that anglophones far outnumber francophones and as such the onus is on the English majority to make concessions and share the responsibility of promoting official language minority rights and culture.

We addressed in another section what we called "Why We Must Seek Justice for Canada's Native Peoples." We believe that this issue really lies at the root of our problems as a country. The committee's discussion paper asks how we can achieve justice for our aboriginal peoples. We hesitate to tell this committee how this should be done, because we question our right as a non-native organization to suggest to native peoples how they should seek justice.

However, the crisis in our relations with native peoples cannot be solved by provincial governments alone; it demands federal action. We urge the provincial government to press the federal government to recognize its fundamental responsibility in this respect. Negotiations must be conducted among equal partners with a shared goal of self-determination for native peoples. By working to achieve this we hope to discover the real value of being Canadian.

Another section of the brief looked at what multiculturalism means to Ontario. Unfortunately, as we considered this question, we realized that too often multicultural policies have not been a means of upward mobility for multicultural groups in Ontario. The economic and social contribution of ethnic and visible minorities to Canadian society has been seriously limited as a result of systemic economic discrimination. We believe it is incumbent upon Ontario to show that multiculturalism could be a bond between all its diverse groups, a philosophy that could aid individuals. The province should celebrate its diversity, not its divisiveness, and it should use its multiculturalism policies to foster and develop intercultural understanding and to create a more harmonious society.

For the concluding section I am going to turn it over to Jim Zamprelli, our executive director.

Mr Zamprelli: As you have heard, we are convinced that Canadians across this country share a number of common values. While not always held high for all to see, these values have been instrumental in shaping the country we have come to know and call our home. We believe in fairness and social justice which looks beyond the individual and provides for the collective wellbeing of all people.

A la foi en quoi ? Aux libertés fondamentales de la personne et aux droits individuels de chacun d'entre nous.

Canada never was and is not now composed of a single group of people who speak the same language or practise the same traditions. We believe in the value of linguistic and cultural diversity and continue to welcome people from every continent of the world.

La culture franco-canadienne ou Canadienne française, si vous voulez, sa langue et ses institutions sont d'une importance fondamentale à l'identité canadienne et à l'existence et la survie de notre pays. On est convaincu que les deux cultures fondatrices, soit la culture anglaise et la culture française, peuvent coexister en harmonie et en esprit

de collaboration entre elles et avec d'autres cultures qui englobent notre fait canadien.

Furthermore, we believe in justice for the aboriginal people of Canada and the recognition of their fundamental rights as first nations.

The choices we are now facing require us to embrace these values in approaching the necessary political and constitutional reforms before us. These values have quietly shaped the prouder elements of our past and contain the guiding principles which were sorely lacking in previous discussions on the future of Canada.

We would like to offer you a quote from Eugene Forsey, who compared the evolution of this country to the building of a house which nevertheless remains unfinished. He said:

"The Fathers wrought well, and laid our foundations deep and strong. But the building is still unfinished, and parts of it have suffered some damage through the years. It does not need a bombing squad or a wrecking crew. But it does need alterations, repairs, additions, the expansion of certain rooms; and all of us must be made to feel at home in it."

We feel we are all architects, builders and residents of this house.

Mr Melchers: That concludes our presentation. I just want to leave with you our hope for what this committee will contribute to the debate on Canada's future, that is, to contribute to this debate a vision that makes us feel comfortable in what is being discussed, not a vision which is based on dividing communities into segments but a vision of bringing things together for the pursuit of a common set of goals which represent the values which we as Canadians all share. That has not been the case to this point, and we have very high hopes that your committee's deliberations will help us feel comfortable in the debate that is going on about the future of this country.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We will try to do our best to meet that challenge. We appreciate the detail of the brief that you have put before us and the fact that you have gone to the trouble you have to address some of those specific areas in the kind of detail you have. Thank you very much for being a great help to us.

1340

L'UNION CULTURELLE DES FRANCO-ONTARIENNES

The Chair: We do have one last presentation, which I am told will be very brief, from L'Union culturelle des Franco-Ontariennes, Doris Thibodeau and Claire Paladeau. Bonjour.

Mme Thibodeau : Monsieur le Président, mesdames, messieurs du comité spécial sur la place de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, nous vous remercions de donner l'occasion aux Ontariens et Ontariennes de nous exprimer à ce moment délicat et déterminant de notre histoire.

L'Union culturelle des Franco-Ontariennes est un organisme regroupant 3000 Franco-Ontariennes provenant de 70 communautés francophones rurales et semi-rurales de l'Ontario. Depuis 55 ans, l'Union culturelle concerte ses efforts à promouvoir l'épanouissement des femmes au sein du foyer et dans la société à améliorer le statut socioéconomique des femmes par la formation, l'information et la

revendication. À ceci s'ajoute la promotion de la langue et de la culture françaises.

Nous aimerions aujourd'hui porter à votre attention les questions qui intéressent les femmes et leurs familles. Nous reconnaissons les efforts que le gouvernement de l'Ontario et que notre communauté ont investis pour que les francophones se sentent partie prenante de la société et participant au dynamisme de l'Ontario. Mais quand on est femme et de surcroît francophone, tout n'est pas seulement simple et la réalité est souvent bien sombre. On en vient même quelquefois à ne plus bien savoir si on est d'abord femme ou francophone, tant il a fallu au cours des années nier nos droits en tant que femme, nier nos aspirations personnelles, nier nos besoins pour unir nos forces afin de travailler à la sauvegarde de la langue et de la culture françaises.

Je ne vous apprendrai rien en vous disant que les femmes francophones ont joué un rôle prépondérant dans la surveillance du fait français en Ontario. Leurs luttes furent quotidiennes, isolées et souvent méconnues. Nous les femmes croyons que le gouvernement de l'Ontario peut jouer un rôle avant-gardiste dans les mises en place des services et de structures dans lesquelles les femmes francophones et les femmes en général peuvent s'épanouir et se sentir partie de la société.

Bien que des mesures d'égalité aient été en mise en place, que la discrimination pour des raisons d'invalidité, d'âge, de pauvreté, de race, d'analphabétisme, d'état matrimonial de l'homme, d'orientation sexuelle, de manque d'instruction soit interdite, les femmes ne sont toujours pas des partenaires égales aux hommes dans aucune structure du pouvoir politique, économique ou autre. Elles sont absentes des instances décisionnelles.

Les conséquences sont prévisibles. La pauvreté, le sentiment d'impuissance, le manque de programmes de formation professionnelle n'ont jamais engendré la qualité de vie et il est important d'encourager les femmes à participer davantage à tous les aspects de la vie et de la société. Un des moyens pour y parvenir est de donner une éducation dans leur langue maternelle à toutes les femmes dès leur entrée à l'école, et ce jusqu'à l'université. Il faut donner aux femmes la formation dont elles ont besoin pour rivaliser de compétence sur le marché du travail.

Les institutions découlant de ce droit à l'éducation devront être gérées par chacune des trois communautés nationales : anglophone, autochtone et francophone. L'éducation provient non seulement des institutions scolaires mais aussi des bibliothèques, des médias, des services sociaux des groupes d'entraide.

Les services de garderie doivent être disponibles aux parents de jeunes enfants qui désirent travailler. Les parents ont besoin de ces services de garde pour se joindre à la population active et y rester, et les employeurs doivent pouvoir compter sur une population active où les parents de jeunes enfants sont de plus en plus nombreux. Les services de garderie devraient, selon nous, inclure les infrastructures nécessaires aux différents âges de la garde des enfants et être accessibles dans leur langue maternelle.

Mme Peladeau : La place des femmes dans l'économie. Sur le plan économique, les femmes n'ont pas atteint l'égalité, et il reste de nombreux obstacles à surmonter.

Encore aujourd'hui, le travail des femmes n'est ni bien compris, ni bien rétribué et ce, même si elles ont toujours travaillé au foyer ou ailleurs. Le gouvernement doit accorder une grande priorité au dossier économique et multiplier les interventions dans les secteurs du commerce, de la fiscalité, de l'emploi et de la formation afin que les besoins des femmes soient compris et incorporés à la planification, la prise de décision et la mise en oeuvre.

Des mesures doivent être mises de l'avant pour redresser les déséquilibres en milieu de travail, notamment en ce qui a trait à l'équité salariale et à l'équité en matière d'emploi. Même si certaines mesures ont été mises sur pied, force nous est de constater que ces mesures ne sont pas pleinement efficaces ; les succès remportés ne se sont pas répercutés sur toutes les femmes. Des approches plus globales s'imposent donc, pour profiter aux jeunes femmes, aux femmes dont les aptitudes au travail sont insuffisantes.

Des progrès ont été réalisés pour éliminer les formes les plus flagrantes de discrimination à l'égard des femmes, mais la discrimination systématique existe toujours dans les structures et les principes qui régissent la société. Pour atteindre l'équité en matière d'emploi, les femmes francophones doivent avoir accès égal aux programmes d'éducation et de formation dans leur langue maternelle et aussi avoir droit à des emplois non traditionnels.

Au sujet de la pauvreté, quand pourrions-nous cesser de parler de pauvreté en Ontario ? La pauvreté frappe fort chez les femmes francophones et les femmes autochtones. Elle est liée à l'isolement, à l'analphabétisme, à l'absence de garderies, au grand nombre d'emplois à temps partiel offerts aux femmes, au caractère saisonnier du travail des femmes rurales, à l'inégalité salariale et au taux de chômage marqué chez les femmes. La pauvreté fait des ravages immédiats sur ses victimes mais ses effets sont pernicieux à long terme. Elle se perpétue d'une génération à l'autre ; elle ronge le droit des femmes à une pleine participation à la société.

À la complexité des questions entourant la pauvreté se mêlent les facteurs tels que le manque de logement, le régime alimentaire mal équilibré, des conditions de vie inadéquates, les stéréotypes et l'étiquette associés à la pauvreté. Les femmes âgées appréhendent la pauvreté en raison de l'insuffisance de pensions et de logements. Donc, nous exigeons des pensions décentes et des logements à prix abordables pour toutes les femmes.

Le régime de santé traditionnel doit être plus facile d'accès ; les femmes veulent en savoir plus sur les solutions de rechange. Elles veulent des centres de santé communautaires mis sur pied par des femmes où elles ont leur mot à dire à toutes les étapes de la gestion, de l'administration des soins, des centres où l'on préconise des approches nouvelles tels que les accouchements par sage-femme et à domicile.

Le régime de santé n'est pas au diapason des besoins des femmes ; les médecins ne semblent pas intéressés aux maladies généralement dites féminines : dépression, épuisement, ménopause, ostéoporose, infections, infécondité, maladies causées par l'usage prolongé de contraceptifs. C'est dans le domaine de la contraception que le régime de santé néglige le plus les femmes. Celles-ci revendiquent depuis longtemps des contraceptifs plus sûrs. Beaucoup de femmes ne jouissent

pas d'un accès égal aux soins de santé, les femmes éloignées des villes, par exemple, les femmes désavantagées, les femmes âgées, des minorités visibles, les immigrantes, les pauvres et les handicapées. Il est primordial que les femmes soient assurées de services de santé et de services sociaux dans leur langue indépendamment de l'endroit où elles vivent.

M. le Président : Excusez-moi, madame, si vous pouvez conclure ; on m'avait indiqué que vous n'auriez besoin que de cinq minutes. On a déjà dépassé ça depuis longtemps et on a surtout presque une heure de retard.

Mme Peladeau : D'accord. Au niveau de la violence, là encore il y a eu des programmes de mis sur pied mais je pense qu'on doit vraiment avoir la volonté politique et puis il faut penser que la violence n'est pas seulement une affaire de femmes, c'est un problème de société, alors on exige encore là des mesures pour éliminer la violence.

Et comme je l'ai mentionné tout à l'heure, par exemple, le gouvernement n'attache pas une grande importance aux valeurs sociales tels qu'un environnement sain, une population scolarisée bien portante, épanouie. Il n'accorde pas beaucoup de valeurs à la propreté de l'eau, à la propreté de l'air, au travail non rémunéré des mères de famille qui restent à la maison pour élever leurs enfants. Nous aimerions que le gouvernement se penche sur ces problèmes que vivent les femmes en Ontario et puis nous insistons pour que le gouvernement de l'Ontario exerce une volonté politique pour instaurer les bases d'une société plus juste et plus égalitaire.

C'est dans cette ligne de pensées que nous croyons que l'Ontario peut jouer un rôle de chef de file en ce qui concerne les négociations pour un Canada uni et fort. Nous pensons que l'Ontario doit jouer un rôle prépondérant dans le rapprochement des différentes régions du pays à cause de sa puissance économique et de sa force d'attraction industrielle. À cause de la présence d'un demi-million de francophones, de nombreux groupes multiculturels, d'une présence importante de communautés autochtones, l'Ontario est bien placé pour maintenir des liens étroits entre les différents éléments de sa communauté et peut servir de modèle aux autres provinces.

Il est important aussi de maintenir des relations avec la province de Québec afin de pouvoir bénéficier de son apport culturel et socioéconomique. Je pense que les trois communautés, les autochtones, les francophones et les anglophones ont le droit de voir leurs acquis protégés et leurs droits historiques et nous insistons aussi pour que l'Ontario se déclare bilingue et qu'il tienne compte des droits, des intérêts et des besoins de la communauté autochtone.

M. le Président : On va terminer là-dessus.

We will break at this point. I am conscious that we are beyond the time and that therefore we will be late resuming this afternoon. I am going to suggest to the committee that we try to come back ready to start by 2:30 at the absolute latest. I know that trims down the break, but I think it is the only way we are going to get through this afternoon. We have a long list of speakers this afternoon and into the evening. We will recess at this point. Thank you.

The committee recessed at 1355.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1443.

The Chair: I would like to call the meeting to order, and on behalf of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation I would like to welcome those of you who have joined us here in the audience this afternoon. We are of course, for those people who are following our meetings over the parliamentary channel, proceeding with our meetings today in Ottawa in the fourth week of our hearings across the province. We heard from a number of organizations this morning, into the early afternoon, and we are continuing with another full afternoon of presentations before us.

CITIZENS COUNCIL OF CANADA

The Chair: I would like to begin by calling Neil McDonald from the Citizens Council of Canada to come forward. While Mr McDonald is coming forward, let me just remind people that because of the number of groups that have asked to speak to us, we have had to ask people to limit the time to within 15 minutes. We appreciate people's co-operation in doing that because it will allow us to try to hear from as many groups as we can.

Go ahead, Mr McDonald.

Mr McDonald: Thank you for the opportunity. From the governed to the governing. Apathy and empathy. Me versus we: If you turn an M upside down, you have "we."

"Weep for Canada." This was an article in the Toronto Sun, 6 August 1981. Mediocracy—and the spelling, when you read the brief, notice it please—is not good enough. A joint submission from a network of groups representing thousands of citizens employing holistic techniques. The network is both formal and informal, dedicated to providing a better understanding, as well as vehicles, to prepare society for survival into the third millennium and beyond on planet earth. We are all citizens who individually and collectively must learn the lesson of human unity once and for all. Then we list the various organizations.

Laurier said nearly 100 years ago that this century we are about to close would be Canada's. He was wrong. The fault lies with each and every one of us, not the least of whom are the ones citizens elected to bring that about. Instead of selecting the best of all worlds, we have become followers, adopting the worst of all worlds since the USA went off the gold standard—and we can thank Nixon for that—and we abandoned our standards of integrity. I think we can also thank Nixon for that.

Canada still has an important role to play in the world community. Historically, Ontario had played a leading part. The ancient humanistic concepts of Dr Erasmus of Rotterdam and his modern counterpart, Tommy Douglas, can still be applied—ageless values. Such possibilities under our present antiquated system can only be accomplished by you, as we the citizens have transferred our power to you. It is only by having one foot in history and the other in the future now, can we reach attainable human goals, inspiring all.

Since one of four of my great-grandfathers arrived in Canada in 1854, few Canadian families have contributed more, few have sacrificed as much. The mentor to such as Sir Joseph Flavelle and Canadian-born Cyrus Eaton, his mark was left indelibly in the North American mosaic.

Then we run into this headline of 6 August, "Weep for Canada." To see days and days and days of constitutional discussions while Canada burned at that time was almost too much for this citizen. We live in a vulture culture, and I for one was intrigued to have the opportunity to go to Prague, Czechoslovakia, in 1968 to see history in the making and have paid dearly for that audacity.

Listed are perhaps a dozen commissions of this type addressed over the last 10 to 15 years. The first topic we want to address is a letter to Evelyn Gigantes re a default judgement of \$755 million against the province of Ontario, Lévesque versus the Queen.

On Friday 25 January 1991, I phoned the above riding office, asking the cabinet minister Gigantes to phone me over the weekend, leaving the essential details. To this day, over one month later, no call from her.

Likewise, a month has passed since I phoned my own MPP, Mrs O'Neill, to call me. Madam, nobody is that busy.

The grave danger exists. They have infiltrated all levels of government here in Canada, including the highest in the land. There is only one more court and if ineptly handled, or as some of us think, ordered to, that sinister international group gets \$755 million of Ontario taxpayers' money.

They ran an ad last winter in the Victoria paper using the largest auditorium at the Victoria university. The topic advertised was sex, s-e-x, in the third millennium. I went to hear them. It should have been spelled s-e-c-t-s. The speaker was welcomed like it was the second coming of Christ. It is very frightening. It has been ignored by all, and what makes it more frightening is our government we elected. The only cabinet minister of the NDP government here in Ottawa never called back. They, the group I am speaking of, masquerade under democracy but manipulated democracy. You will read more in the presentation. I am skipping.

1450

The next subject, perhaps even interrelated, is the Governor General of Canada. One of the groups loosely associated with us believes the present Governor General is illegally appointed due to a conflict of interest which we have attached to our presentation. If it is true, and the present Attorney General of Ontario was so advised on this matter on several occasions, all legislation passed since his appointment, including whether our armed forces in the Gulf should be there or not according to law, is in severe doubt.

Surely we expect better than the Attorney General of Ontario to ignore such a possibility. These are people who are legal experts. They are not lawyers; they are paralegals. But they read law, I read law, you read law. It is just sufficiently possible that it also is very frightening. Totally

ignored. The citizens of Ontario and Canada deserve better. No wonder many Canadians feel betrayed.

The last subject is relics and records of antiquity. Ontario is dragging its feet, although special delivery this morning before the presentation they did send me their latest information which I have been waiting since 3 January to get. Ontario is not quite as out of touch as the federal government, but it is enough to make you vomit when you read about the legislation planned for Canada to protect our artefacts and our records. And the word "record" does not even come up in any of the legislation proposed by Ontario or Ottawa. Our concern is Nova Scotia, Oak Island, but here in Canada, right here in Ontario, I should say Deep River, we have evidence that Henry Hudson got as far as Deep River. And the evidence was found. A school teacher has that and will not, for example, let me see it. It is not his. I said: "You are only the guardian of that."

Closing remarks: As one listens to the various submissions as carried on TVOntario, one must observe it is all academic if we do not get our act together and if you do not get your act together. If such a simple thing as messages of a few minutes are handled thus—and you will see how many times I had to dial to get through to find out whether I could make this submission or not—how in the hell can the citizens of Ontario expect you will get our messages straight from perhaps a maximum of 2,000 in many locations in this vast province?

At the IEEE conference 1973-74, the founder of Sony said: "We believed in Trinitron to the degree we were prepared to bankrupt the company to pull it off." That is dedication. This citizen since 1967-68 has also been dedicated to Canada, and you will see the sad story of what it is costing.

I see I am running close to the end of my time. I will skip a bit here. One must ask: What is happening to and in this great country? When one seeks redress through the Ontario Ombudsman, the human rights, letters to Queen's Park ignored, and now see the NDP doing exactly the same, then weep for Ontario too, not just Canada.

We as Canadians have been betrayed: 1984, Mulroney; 1985, Bourassa—I was there in Quebec City at that time—1986, Peterson, and now the pattern is repeating itself, 1990 with the Ontario NDP government. We list many communications; I will skip all through that.

The choice is simple. The decision is easy, but who has the will if not the NDP?

My conclusions: The sinister force. Forget Saddam; he is only concerned about one billion Muslims and he feeds on dissent. And this other group feeds on dissent. If that group has infiltrated the province of Quebec, the high dissent factor for some years, to a larger degree than Ontario, with help from Ottawa knowingly or not, is it just a coincidence that (1) the space lab (2) the rights institute and now (3) the heritage group and (4) the long-standing James Bay project that water and power advocates promote are natural resources being converted into megabucks?

At Coe Hill, Ontario, were two murders unsolved linked to this group. There are 16 more murders, suicides and arsons in eastern Ontario and Quebec. Are these also

linked under a variety of police levels, perhaps 16 different jurisdictions, versus one operating under one jurisdiction?

The end of my submission. I appreciate the opportunity to warn Canadians that it is not what it seems. This is the letter to Evelyn Gigantes—totally ignored. And that is part of my submission.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

Mr McDonald: Questions, if you will.

The Chair: I do not see that there are any. Questions? Okay. Thank you very much, sir.

ASSOCIATION FRANÇAISE DES MUNICIPALITÉS DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : Je voudrais inviter Gisèle Lalonde, de l'Association française des municipalités de l'Ontario.

Mme Lalonde : Au nom des membres de l'Association française des municipalités de l'Ontario, je vous remercie de nous donner l'occasion de vous présenter notre vision de l'Ontario et particulièrement de la francophonie ontarienne au sein de la future Confédération canadienne.

Notre désir de participer au processus que vous menez vient du fait que ceux et celles que nous représentons, c'est-à-dire les élus et les gestionnaires francophones oeuvrant sur la scène municipale ontarienne, sont parmi les hommes et les femmes politiques, ceux et celles qui entretiennent les contacts les plus étroits et les plus intimes avec les communautés ontariennes. Nous ne risquons pas de nous tromper en disant que la majorité des municipalités de l'Ontario sont constituées, à des proportions différentes, bien entendu, des communautés qui forment la mosaïque de notre société. Le rôle et la voie de nos membres sont donc d'une importance capitale dans le processus de redéfinition de l'Ontario au sein du Canada.

Dans le présent mémoire, nous présentons premièrement les aspirations et les intérêts sociaux et économiques des francophones de l'Ontario tels que vus par l'AFMO. Nous faisons ensuite état des principes ou fondements sur lesquels doivent s'appuyer les changements que nous jugeons nécessaires. Nous avons regroupé ces changements sur trois catégories et chacune fait l'objet d'une partie : les fondements sociaux d'une nouvelle Confédération ; les fondements économiques d'une nouvelle Confédération ; et les fondements structuraux d'une nouvelle Confédération.

L'AFMO n'a pas de mandat de commenter la place que doit prendre le Québec, ni les autres provinces ou les nations autochtones dans un Canada redéfini. Nous avons une conviction et c'est la suivante : une structure, pour qu'elle soit efficace, doit respecter l'autonomie de ces composantes tout en visant un but commun. Forts de cette conviction, nous ne pouvons que respecter toute décision que prendront les autres communautés intéressées par leur épanouissement collectif dans une nouvelle Confédération.

Quelles sont les aspirations sociales et économiques des francophones de l'Ontario ? Pour l'AFMO, la réponse est simple. Les francophones de l'Ontario sont et tiennent à demeurer des partenaires à part entière dans l'essor social et économique de l'Ontario et du Canada.

À l'exception de quelques arguments relevant davantage du fanatisme que de la raison, nous ne connaissons pas d'Ontariens ni d'Ontariennes qui s'objectent à ce principe.

Notre association croit que l'Ontario et le Canada ont tout pour innover sur le plan social et pour devenir un modèle de société interculturel fondé sur l'harmonie et les besoins d'actualisation des communautés et des individus. En effet, les yeux du monde entier sont tournés vers nous. Ils nous regardent avec envie pour ce que nous avons toujours représenté, et en même temps avec inquiétude face à ce que nous allons devenir.

1500

Comme l'optimisme et la tenacité demeurent des qualités fondamentales des francophones, nous voyons le processus de révision constitutionnelle dans lequel se retrouve le Canada présentement comme un mécanisme pour identifier les moyens de réaliser le partenariat entre les communautés qui composent le Canada, plutôt qu'un mécanisme pour remettre en question l'existence de ces communautés comme certains le laissent entendre. Dans cette perspective, le présent exercice ne vise pas à justifier notre présence en Ontario puisque nous sommes ici pour y demeurer. Nous tentons plutôt de décrire les façons par lesquelles la reconnaissance officielle du partenariat de la francophonie peut venir enrichir les relations sociales et économiques de la société ontarienne d'une part, ainsi que celle des francophones sur le plan individuel et communautaire d'autre part. Notre mémoire vise donc l'innovation sociale au seuil du 21^e siècle.

Il convient de mentionner ici que les membres de l'AFMO croient que le Canada doit maintenir un système de Confédération. Alors que partout à travers le monde les différentes nations se regroupent sur le plan économique pour faire front commun, il serait tout à fait illogique et irresponsable pour le Canada d'agir autrement. Les principes fondamentaux qui définiront la future Confédération devront d'une part permettre de positionner l'Ontario et le Canada sur le marché mondial, comme des chefs de file, tout en favorisant l'actualisation des individus et des communautés. Il est important de mentionner qu'au moment où la globalisation devient de plus en plus la règle des nations, l'enracinement dans une communauté devient de plus en plus la règle pour les individus. La future Confédération devra tenir compte de cette réalité.

Les Canadiens se sont fait dire à maintes reprises au cours des dernières années qu'ils devaient faire preuve de tolérance parce que le Canada était justement fondé sur ce sentiment. Ce discours, nous l'avons entendu surtout à l'égard des conflits qui sont survenus dans le débat qui entoura l'accord du Lac Meech. Or, en utilisant le terme «tolérance», on ne fait que renforcer le sentiment de supériorité de la majorité et celui d'infériorité de la minorité. En effet, le terme «tolérance» ne comprend pas la notion de respect mutuel mais comprend plutôt la notion de fort-faible. Est-ce là le sentiment et l'attitude que l'on veut encourager chez la majorité linguistique à l'égard des francophones ? Peut-on bâtir un partenariat à part entière sur des sentiments de tolérance ?

Nous préférons parler d'harmonie entre les communautés ontariennes et canadiennes car l'harmonie est l'unité, l'ordre, l'organisation, l'entente, la paix et l'union. «Harmonie» a des connotations d'amitié, d'équilibre et de compréhension. Dans une société basée sur l'harmonie,

l'épanouissement de chaque communauté devrait être perçu comme étant un enrichissement du but commun.

Or, une telle vision suppose que la structure d'ensemble du pays soit bâtie de façon à respecter les aspirations et les intérêts sociaux et économiques spécifiques des communautés. Que la francophonie vive son essor social et économique, par exemple, n'enlève rien à l'essor social et économique de la majorité linguistique. Au contraire, dans la structure que nous préconisons les deux se complètent. Une telle structure favorise la décentralisation et encourage l'autogestion des communautés. Elle suppose enfin une Confédération qui a les pouvoirs que lui confient les communautés.

Bien entendu, ceci signifie qu'au départ toutes les communautés ont adhéré au but commun, soit celui d'établir un partenariat qui vise l'essor économique et social de chaque communauté tout autant que celui de l'ensemble.

Comment l'AFMO définit-elle la communauté francophone ? Nos membres sont d'avis que la communauté francophone de l'Ontario est composée d'individus issus de diverses origines, tant de l'Ontario que d'autres provinces et d'autres nations qui ont un trait en commun : c'est qu'ils ont choisi de vivre en français en Ontario dans un contexte qui favorise l'interculturalisme dans toutes ses expressions. En outre, le concept de communauté francophone n'est pas uniquement relié aux entités géographiques. La francophonie est une communauté mondiale et nous tenons à ce que les liens que nous entretenons avec les autres francophones du Canada, tant du Québec que des autres provinces et des autres nations francophones sur le plan de l'éducation, des arts et de l'économie continuent à exister en s'intensifiant.

C'est à l'intérieur de ces paramètres que les membres de l'AFMO tiennent à se définir et qu'ils demandent au gouvernement de les reconnaître. Il est de notre avis que c'est là une condition essentielle à l'essor économique et social de la communauté francophone ontarienne et à celui de la province.

Quant à la communauté anglophone et aux nations autochtones, il en revient à chacune d'entre elles de se définir comme elles l'entendent et d'identifier l'étendue de leur participation au sein de la nouvelle Confédération.

Le partenariat à part entière s'appuie sur l'apport de la spécificité culturelle des communautés linguistiques à l'essor social et économique de leur municipalité, de leur province et du pays. Un tel principe repose sur le pouvoir égal des partenaires plutôt que sur leur caractère majoritaire ou minoritaire, c'est-à-dire qu'il ne confère pas aux partenaires un pouvoir proportionnel au nombre de personnes qu'ils représentent respectivement.

Puisque le partenariat à part entière consiste à reconnaître les partenaires sur une base d'égal à égal, n'est-ce pas qu'il serait inadmissible que l'un ou l'autre des partenaires ait à poser des gestes supplémentaires et différents pour être admis au groupe ? Pourtant, c'est ce que fait la législation ontarienne qui établit présentement le mode de recensement municipal et scolaire, puisqu'elle veut que tous les Ontariens et les Ontariennes soient anglophones jusqu'à ce qu'ils aient prouvé qu'ils sont francophones. Cette situation est absolument inacceptable et elle devra

être modifiée pour que tous les Ontariens et toutes les Ontariennes aient à s'identifier soit comme anglophones, soit comme francophones.

Le partenariat à part entière suppose également qu'un immigrant qui s'établit en Ontario n'est pas automatiquement intégré à la communauté anglophone mais qu'il se voit donner le libre choix d'adhérer à l'une des deux communautés de langue officielle dès son arrivée dans la province. Ceci suppose enfin que l'infrastructure existe de façon efficace pour permettre à cette personne de joindre les rangs de la communauté qu'elle a choisie.

Une société démocratique, parce qu'elle est régie par le principe de la majorité, doit adopter des moyens de protéger ses communautés minoritaires dont l'existence est fondamentale à sa définition. C'est le but de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés. On comprendra facilement que sans une telle reconnaissance, une minorité dans la meilleure des situations démocratiques ne pourrait en aucun temps espérer son actualisation. On ne peut donc plus parler de démocratie au Canada sans tenir compte des articles de la Charte, et l'AFMO croit fermement que les protections constitutionnelles doivent être maintenues.

Cependant, les droits constitutionnels ne veulent rien dire si personne n'a l'obligation de les appliquer. La sociologue et philosophe française Simone Weil écrivait dans une de ses œuvres : «L'accomplissement effectif d'un droit provient non pas de celui qui le possède mais des autres hommes qui se sentent obligés à quelque chose envers lui... Un droit qui n'est reconnu par personne ne vaut pas grand'chose».

La reconnaissance des droits constitutionnels dépend en grande partie des gouvernements provinciaux. Quand nos droits constitutionnels en tant que francophones de l'Ontario ne sont pas respectés, nous avons comme seul recours le processus politique ou les contestations devant les tribunaux. Bien que les francophones développent de plus en plus le pouvoir politique malgré le fait qu'ils soient minoritaires, c'est encore le recours aux tribunaux qui demeure le mécanisme le plus propice pour assurer la reconnaissance de nos droits. Jusqu'à ce jour, les tribunaux ont donné des orientations aux gouvernements mais nous savons très bien que les juges dans les domaines constitutionnels se gardent bien d'imposer des directions précises aux législateurs. Il en revient donc toujours à la volonté politique de choisir ou non d'appliquer les droits des minorités.

Or, l'AFMO maintient qu'un gouvernement ne peut faire abstraction d'un droit constitutionnel quel qu'il soit ou retirer ce droit sans commettre pour autant une injustice flagrante. En outre, une telle approche vient à l'encontre même du principe de partenariat, privant par le fait même la société ontarienne d'une expression d'elle-même et handicapant son essor social et économique.

La prochaine Confédération devra faire en sorte que les gouvernements soient tenus d'appliquer les droits constitutionnels des communautés de langues officielles.

Que l'on soit d'accord en principe avec ce qui suit ou non, il reste que les arguments les plus fréquents auxquels les francophones sont confrontés à chaque fois qu'ils parlent de services et de droits relèvent de l'aspect économique. Si l'argent n'était pas une préoccupation constante tant pour

les individus que pour les gouvernements, la reconnaissance de la francophonie ne poserait pas autant de problèmes. Que ces préoccupations soient issues de fausses perceptions ou non, il reste que nous devons tous surmonter l'obstacle qu'elles représentent.

Il va de soi que la reconnaissance des droits de toutes les minorités comporte des dépenses supplémentaires pour une société, et nous déplorons le fait que l'application de nos droits soit toujours étudiée et évaluée en fonction des priorités financières. Cependant, puisque aujourd'hui le discours que tiennent les Ontariens et les Ontariennes dans ce processus de révision constitutionnelle tourne autour de l'essor économique de l'Ontario, il s'avère par le fait même essentiel de parler d'engagements financiers et d'investissements.

1510

Sans vouloir réduire notre présence aux bénéfices que retirerait l'Ontario de la reconnaissance de nos droits, il est important de signaler que les francophones de l'Ontario veulent et peuvent apporter un élément unique à l'essor économique de l'Ontario. Nous représentons un atout économique important pour la société ontarienne et c'est aussi dans cette perspective qu'il faut regarder les coûts reliés à la reconnaissance de nos droits.

Il ne faut pas sous-estimer les bénéfices que comporterait pour nous-mêmes et pour la société ontarienne la pleine reconnaissance de notre partenariat dans l'essor social et économique de la province et du pays. Il s'agit d'ailleurs d'une aspiration profonde de la communauté francophone. Nous n'avons jamais voulu vivre aux dépens de la majorité. Bien au contraire, nos revendications depuis toujours ont été motivées par notre désir de participer pleinement au développement économique de notre société.

Nous avons mentionné dans le chapitre portant sur les fondements sociaux que les membres de l'AFMO préféreraient se rallier à une communauté mondiale francophone au lieu de s'isoler dans une identité régionale, et par le fait même restrictive sur le plan des actions. À l'heure actuelle où les blocs économiques se multiplient à travers le monde, les élus et les gestionnaires francophones de la scène municipale ont déjà commencé à établir des liens économiques et sociaux avec des homologues d'autres pays francophones. Les échanges et les initiatives que nous avons entrepris sont rendus possibles en premier lieu parce que la communication et la compréhension sont facilitées du fait que nous parlons la même langue. Nous représentons pour les pays francophones un pont entre leur réalité et l'Amérique du Nord de la même façon que nous représentons pour l'Ontario un pont entre les intérêts de la province et les pays francophones.

Prenons par exemple le projet d'Afrique 2000 mis de l'avant par la Fédération canadienne des municipalités et auquel participe certains de nos membres. Ce projet constitue un service de ressources techniques et de formation offert par des municipalités canadiennes à des municipalités africaines. Dans le cadre de ce projet, la ville de Hawkesbury, par exemple, est jumelée à la ville francophone d'Esseka au Cameroun. Cet échange existe grâce au caractère francophone de la ville de Hawkesbury. D'autres municipalités ayant dans leurs rangs des francophones évaluent présentement la possibilité de participer à ce projet canadien. La

ville de Rockland, par exemple, est en voie d'établir un jumelage avec une ville du Niger.

Il s'agit aussi de constater les projets internationaux francophones de l'Association Ontario-France, de la Chambre économique de l'Ontario, de la Cité collégiale, de l'Université d'Ottawa et de l'Université Laurentienne pour se rendre compte de l'importance du potentiel que représentent les initiatives francophones pour l'essor économique de l'Ontario.

Enfin, mentionnons qu'il n'y a pas de limites au caractère de ces échanges puisque les francophones sont actifs dans toutes les sphères d'activités de la société ontarienne.

Le bilinguisme officiel en Ontario. Lors de son congrès annuel de 1985, l'AMO, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, adoptait une résolution qui avait été proposée par la ville de Vanier à l'effet que des revendications soient faites auprès du gouvernement de l'Ontario pour que ce dernier déclare la province officiellement bilingue. Malgré ce geste démontrant le leadership des élus anglophones et francophones de la scène municipale, aucun gouvernement provincial depuis n'a donné suite à cette résolution. Cette hésitation à agir de la part des gouvernements n'a eu pour effet que de soulever et de donner raison aux stratégies négatives de certaines personnes et de certains groupes contre la francophonie. Nos membres savent mieux que qui que ce soit que parler du bilinguisme officiel soulève encore toutes sortes de sentiments d'appréhension dans les communautés.

En devenant officiellement bilingue, l'Ontario endosserait par le fait même le plein partenariat de la francophonie. Ici, cela occasionnerait des dépenses supplémentaires ou du moins une rationalisation créative des priorités budgétaires, mais la province et les francophones en retireraient des profits sûrs. La francophonie serait heureuse de finalement pouvoir investir ses énergies à innover sur le plan social et économique plutôt que de les dépenser à faire reconnaître ses droits.

Plus que des services en français, le bilinguisme officiel signifierait que les intérêts de la francophonie seraient considérés dans l'adoption des plans d'action et la prise de décisions à tous les paliers et dans tous les domaines d'activités. Cela ne voudrait pas dire que tous les Ontariens et toutes les Ontariennes devraient parler deux langues. Ils pourraient demeurer unilingues anglophones ou même unilingues francophones s'ils le désirent.

Un ministère des Affaires francophones au palier provincial. La structure qui prévaut présentement au palier provincial est insuffisante. Plus qu'un ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones, il nous faut un ministre des Affaires francophones qui aurait pour mandat de recommander au Cabinet les orientations et les décisions qui tiendront compte des intérêts de la francophonie. Les coordonnateurs des services en français, plutôt que de travailler dans l'isolement comme c'est le cas présentement, relèveraient de ce nouveau ministère où il détermineraient ensemble les orientations communes pour les questions francophones. Ceci ne les empêcherait pas d'avoir également une allégeance au ministère où ils seraient assignés.

Une des raisons marquantes pour lesquelles le système actuel de prise de décisions politiques ne fonctionne pas

relève du manque flagrant de consultation auprès des communautés. Ce manque est inévitable dans la structure actuelle puisque les paliers de gouvernement sont centralisés au niveau provincial et fédéral et par le fait même sont très loin des réalités communautaires. Il est difficile pour ces superstructures d'adopter des décisions qui tiennent compte de toutes les réalités et qui sont applicables partout. Il s'avère essentiel que dans la nouvelle Confédération, la prise de décisions soit réorientée afin de tenir compte des besoins et des aspirations communautaires dont seuls les élus municipaux peuvent en mesurer l'impact et la pertinence.

Le système parlementaire actuel ne reconnaît pas le niveau municipal comme un niveau de gouvernement. Or, les membres de l'AFMO réclament qu'une modification importante soit apportée au système parlementaire pour qu'un troisième palier de gouvernement soit créé et reconnu officiellement. Dans ce sens, nous croyons que le gouvernement municipal et/ou régional devrait devenir ce nouveau palier gouvernemental et qu'il devrait avoir des pouvoirs de gestion et de consultation précis.

En conclusion, nous avons énoncé dans ce mémoire les fondements sociaux, économiques et structurels sur lesquels la structure provinciale et la future Confédération devront être établies.

En terminant, nous tenons à citer le philosophe et psychologue italien Moreno qui disait : «L'avenir d'un peuple, en dernière instance, dépend de la créativité de ses membres».

Alors, Monsieur le Président et membres du comité, en tant qu'élus et gestionnaires francophones de la scène municipale de l'Ontario, soyez assurés que nous ferons preuve de toute la créativité possible pour que notre communauté, notre province et notre pays puissent devenir un modèle de société où l'harmonie et le partenariat à part entière sont à la base de toute activité sociale et économique.

M. le Président : Merci, madame. On a dépassé le temps. Il y a une question, brève, j'espère. Mrs O'Neill, a brief question.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much, Madame Lalonde. You have worked, at least for most of the last 20 years, in a community where the majority of the people are English speaking, but you have represented a very—what should I say?—concentrated group of francophones within that community. Throughout that time I have seen you as being a very effective leader for francophones and I am sure a lot of people would agree with me.

You have reiterated and have reiterated throughout this brief, partnership, and that is a word we are beginning to hear more of as we work our way through these hearings. I wonder if you could say a little bit about that from the perspective I have just placed you in, how the francophone community can build partnerships, whether it be at the municipal or provincial level, with the majority. You have talked about structures that francophones need to support themselves and we certainly have heard that from many francophones, but can you give us some practical ways in which these partnerships to build understanding, to build stronger economic units, to provide better social services can be built?

Mme Lalonde : Je crois que l'AFMO veut justement bâtir ce partenariat avec les anglophones ou les gens d'autres ethnies qui sont membres dans les municipalités. Par exemple, au niveau du développement professionnel de nos membres, en regardant ce que vous avez au Ministry of Skills Development au gouvernement provincial, nous reconnaissons qu'il n'y a absolument aucun document, séminaire ou outil qu'on peut mettre à la disposition actuellement des élus et gestionnaires municipaux en français. Nous avons, par contre, de la traduction qui est en train de se faire mais pour nous la traduction n'est pas suffisante. Nous voulons traduction et adaptation. C'est une des questions, disons, qui nous intéressent énormément.

Sur le plan de partenariat, je crois qu'on a toujours entendu dire que ça coûtait cher d'offrir des services en français. Nous avons plusieurs municipalités qui se sont déclarées bilingues mais nous avons quand même des municipalités — si je prends l'exemple de North Bay — qui ont une forte proportion de francophones et qui n'ont jamais eu d'élus francophones encore dans cette municipalité. Nous aimerions qu'il y ait des moyens sur place pour encourager et sensibiliser nos jeunes et ensuite les encourager pour qu'ensuite un jour ils deviennent des chefs de file dans leur communauté.

On ne peut pas parler de partenariat si on n'a pas les gens en place pour nous représenter. Comme vous le savez, nous venons d'avoir notre première Franco-Ontarienne au gouvernement fédéral et nous avons très peu de Franco-Ontariens qui ont été élus au provincial. Nous n'avons pas encore eu une femme franco-ontarienne, malheureusement, au provincial. J'espère que ça va venir mais disons qu'on ne peut pas parler de partenariat quand on ne fait pas partie du pouvoir décisionnel.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for a creative answer.
1520

CITY OF OTTAWA'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VISIBLE MINORITIES

The Chair: I call next Chris Harris and Nizam Siddiqui from the Advisory Committee on Visible Minorities.

Mr Siddiqui: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the select committee. My name is Nizam Siddiqui. I regret to inform you that Chris Harris of the city of Ottawa's advisory committee cannot attend today. However, I will make a presentation on behalf of the advisory committee on this subject.

The City of Ottawa's Advisory Committee on Visible Minorities was established in December 1982. Over the past decade, the ethnic and racial diversity of Ottawa's population has become evident as existing cultural communities have expanded and new communities formed, largely as a result of increased immigration from non-European countries.

As the race relations advisory body to the city of Ottawa, we have found ourselves advising on issues of local, national and international import because of our location in the nation's capital. It is inevitable that our committee has been sensitized to issues at the federal level due to our proximity here. For this reason, we bring a unique perspective to your deliberations that stems from our specific concerns for

our community but is informed as to the global implications of our positions.

Since its inception, the advisory committee has taken a leadership role as demonstrated by our multiculturalism policy for the city of Ottawa, which was approved in March 1985 as a direct result of our initiatives. This policy, which encompasses all areas of the city of Ottawa's operations, including policy, programs and services, is the most comprehensive document of its type passed by a Canadian municipality. We have also undertaken initiatives in the area of training of municipal employees and are actively involved in establishing a multicultural centre in the city as well.

Our concerns with any future constitutional talks in which Ontario participates can be summarized in two words, ambiguity and rigidity, and the need to avoid these. It is our hope that through discussion, this province can establish grounds for more informed participation by all concerned parties, thereby leading to a more responsive constitutional document that clearly reflects our multicultural heritage.

Before expressing our position, however, the advisory committee would first like to comment upon the process that preceded the signing of the Meech Lake constitutional accord on 30 April 1987. It is our belief that this hastily conceived document gave much cause for future concern, because we did not pause and reflect on the far-reaching implications of many of the provisions that it contained. It is now apparent that this constitutional document, meant to establish guidelines for our future evolution, succumbed to a number of ills, of which the most prominent was political expediency. Throughout our submission we will refer back to components of this accord to shed light on the direction we would now like Ontario to proceed in.

One restriction that has always been willingly accepted by Canadians as part of the cost of participating in a democracy is the transfer of our decision-making capacity as individuals to our leaders for greater effectiveness. This is a trust essential to its functioning. The 1987 constitutional accord saw this trust violated when not only those elected failed to take into consideration the interests of all Canadians, namely, the multicultural communities, Quebec's minorities, aboriginal peoples and the citizens of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, but as well there was a failure on the part of our leadership to properly consult us to compensate for this lapse, and that is all you can call it.

The advisory committee appreciates this opportunity to place its concerns before the select committee on Ontario in Confederation but feels compelled to point out that after-the-fact consultation of concerned individuals and organizations is far from ideal, taking as our base the province's active participation in the 1987 constitutional accord discussions.

It is our suggestion that the select committee's final report address the key issues of process raised by the 1987 accord and recommend that the concerns of affected groups be shifted from the peripheral position that they now occupy to the central position that they warrant. This is imperative given the likelihood of an amendment formula which may call for unanimity for any future changes,

a prerequisite that may be somewhat optimistic given the disparate interests and objectives of the provincial and the federal governments.

Proceeding to the role of Quebec in Confederation, the advisory committee does not deny the importance of recognizing the distinctness of Quebec society within Canada. However, our concern arises out of any constitutional document that identifies Quebec's distinctness, yet makes no mention of other distinct components in the Canadian mosaic. This leads to one of two conclusions, as identified in the report of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons; that is, as either as "an intentional downplaying of Canadians whose ethnic origin is neither English nor French, or as a telling lapse which indicates that Canada's political leaders are insufficiently sensitive to present political realities."

The aspirations of the Quebec government to nurture and preserve its French heritage and the provincial governments in recognizing the legitimacy of these concerns are applauded by our advisory committee. It is our belief that we are diminished as a country if we are unable to recognize and adapt to the differing needs of each of our multicultural societies. However, this recognition of Quebec must not be at the expense of the aspirations of Canada's ethnic communities or its aboriginal peoples.

The Quebec government's power, as was defined in the Meech Lake accord, to "preserve and protect the distinct society of Quebec" has to be further clarified if that is to be given. The rights of the cultural and linguistic minorities within Quebec can be subjugated to those of French-speaking Quebecers if the latter are given explicit recognition with no protection. We believe that a specific reference to Quebec's commitment to ensure that its actions will not result in discrimination against its minorities is required.

The further distinction that bilingual rights should be protected by the Constitution while multiculturalism and protection against discrimination may possibly be restricted to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms artificially increases the gap between our member cultures. It is of great concern to us that the present view of multiculturalism appears to exclude francophone Canadians as outside its ambit, which is not the case.

It is our contention that multiculturalism expands to encompass the differing needs of our distinct societies and we object to barriers that would separate us. English Canadians and French Canadians are as much a part of the multicultural milieu of the country as are Ukrainian Canadians, Chinese Canadians or East Indian Canadians.

We would take issue with any restrictive role on the federal and provincial governments to preserve the fundamental characteristic of Canada as we currently perceive it. In the event that an amendment is made to include multiculturalism as part of that fundamental characteristic in the future, additional amendments should be made to ensure that the federal and provincial governments are also required to promote these characteristics.

Both bilingualism and multiculturalism are dependent upon the active participation at all levels of government. The present use of the concept "preserve," with its image

of the maintenance of the status quo, does not make sufficient allowance for the dynamism of the aspirations of our distinct communities. The living dimension of any Constitution should nurture rather than restrict the development of Canada's distinct societies.

For this reason we would support the contention of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council and others that affirmation of the equal position of our multicultural communities concurrently with the specific needs of Quebec be provided for. At present, multiculturalism is subordinate to the rights of French-speaking Quebecers. It is inevitable that once Canada is defined bilingually, the bicultural presumption will infuse our views of ourselves, thereby further eroding the rights of other ethnocultural communities, including those of francophones outside of Quebec.

It is not currently clear whether the general provision of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is sufficient protection for those individuals who may suffer discrimination as a direct result of the application of the existing Constitution, ie, the BNA Act, such as actions taken by Quebec to preserve and protect its distinct society. Aside from the issue of ambiguity, we are concerned about the financial burden that will be transferred to individual citizens as they seek clarification and protection through the courts.

Our concern is reinforced by the fact that a number of other Canadian ethnocultural organizations share our uneasiness that linguistic equality/distinct society provisions in the future can have potential negative connotations for the status of multiculturalism in Canada.

In the report of the special joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, this concern was expressed by the German Canadian Congress which stated that:

"It is our position that the interpretation clause of the Constitution"—and they were referring to the Meech Lake accord at that particular time—"is not true to the social reality of Canada in the 1980s and, for that matter, in the future. It recognizes a linguistic duality, an English-French duality, which is only part of the Canadian society we live in today. Whether we speak of cultural pluralism, community of communities, sociocultural mosaic or multiculturalism, the fact is that we are a society quite different from the 1940s and the 1950s and one that is undergoing sociocultural changes of enormous proportions."

The Chinese Canadian National Council went further and stated to the same joint committee:

"If the linguistic duality clause is allowed to stand by itself without a similar clause addressing multiculturalism, which would include these members of our community, the Constitution will not be broad enough to address the true nature and reality of Canada fully. In other words, bilingualism does not embrace all Canadians—it may officially but may not in fact—whereas multiculturalism does."

1530

It is clear, based on these comments, that any constitutional discussion must address the concerns of Canada's multicultural community, eg, enshrining multiculturalism in the national Constitution. The federal government must be responsible for not just preserving but rather promoting the bilingual nature of Canada and not merely emphasizing

linguistic duality, and this is something that Ontario has to share in as well.

The advisory committee believes that if the multicultural reality of Canada is not recognized now, it never will be. We are not opposed to describing linguistic duality as a fundamental characteristic of Canada but rather its opposition results from the omission of multiculturalism being described as a fundamental characteristic as well. Reflecting on this omission, the advisory committee proposes that multiculturalism be recognized as an interpretative principle for any future Constitution in Canada.

It must be stated on the record by the advisory committee that for ethnic and visible minorities, any constitutional agreement must achieve three goals, including: one, recognizing that multiculturalism is a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society and must be preserved and promoted by federal and provincial governments; two, ensuring that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is not adversely affected by any Constitution of Canada, especially section 15, the equality rights clause, which guarantees freedom from discrimination; three, repealing the "notwithstanding" clause of the charter which is an escape hatch for governments who may want to withdraw rights.

We understand also that the select committee will be receiving numerous briefs from concerned native leaders enumerating their concerns. It is our desire to lend our support to their assertions as well and remind the committee that they are also distinct societies within Canada. The exclusion of aboriginal leaders from the 1987 constitutional amendment process demonstrates in graphic fashion exactly where the political will of our present governments is on this issue—non-existent.

It is not sufficient to append a reference to enumerated sections of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as adequate protection of the rights of aboriginal peoples. Specific reference to the distinct place of the aboriginal peoples in Canada is required. While we appreciate the concern of all government leaders to include Quebec in the Canadian constitutional family, we would argue that we are behaving like unruly children if we omit native people from direct participation in this process and are far from complete in their absence.

The very grounds upon which Quebec has based its arguments for distinct recognition within Canada and our Constitution are equally applicable to the aboriginal peoples. The aboriginal peoples' request for constitutional recognition of their right to self-determination and self-government stems from the same desire to control their own destiny. To enshrine in the Constitution the rights of Quebec while omitting the rights of aboriginal peoples is profoundly disturbing.

The viewpoint of the aboriginal peoples on this issue was expressed by Zebedee Nugat on behalf of the Inuit Committee on National Issues in 1987 in the report of the special joint committee that I referred to. He stated:

"We have much concern with the distinct society clause, mainly because it abjectly ignores that people or groups other than Quebec are not distinct, it implies that Quebec is the only distinct thing that deserves such special recognition. We know that to be a basic fallacy, because

we are distinct just as much as Quebec is: we are aboriginally distinct. With the distinct society, our concern is that we may be out-distincted by a distinct Quebec, especially if we have the circumstances of living within the boundaries of what is called Quebec now."

In regard to aboriginal concerns, the advisory committee supports the position of the Assembly of First Nations, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the Native Council of Canada. We believe that the basic principles and precepts of social justice have been, for too long, denied to Canadians of aboriginal ancestry. This should not be allowed to continue.

The input of the aboriginal people through their member organizations should be carefully considered and assessed in the light of the tragic historical legacy of promises unkept and unfulfilled and, when kept, singularly lacking in substance. It should be the responsibility of our time to redress the enormous wrong perpetuated on the first inhabitants of the country. Vague promises of aboriginal agenda items for annual consideration by the first ministers should be completely discarded.

This would essentially involve the aboriginal peoples in one or two items of their immediate concern on the entire first ministers' agenda. On issues such as Senate reform, which vitally impact on the aboriginal peoples, they may in fact be excluded under such a process. It is our belief that a formal, ongoing constitutional process to address the issues affecting aboriginal peoples and aboriginal rights has to be established. This is something that Ontario must take a leading role in doing or in initiating.

We also support the objections—and I am going back to the Meech Lake accord as a case in point—of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon regarding any talk of the exclusion from the constitutional amendment process and the adverse impact that any amending formula may have on their attaining full provincial status. It is clear now that they stand posed to accept their responsibility of provincehood. However, as demonstrated in the last series of constitutional discussions, the almost insurmountable obstacle that unanimity represents would have denied Canada its first province capable of articulating and reflecting the views of aboriginal people.

It is not our position that the intention of the framers of this specific amendment was to preserve a particular racial status quo. However, when you couple this result with an examination of provincial attitudes as at the first ministers' conferences on aboriginal self-government, it is difficult to envision how a united political will can be developed in any future constitutional discussion of provincehood for these particular provinces, particularly if an amending formula is not developed. Ontario, therefore, must be involved in this process from the outset as well.

We recommend that Ontario endorse the process of entry into provincehood for the northern territories in this context as being the same as for all other former territories and colonies within Canada: bilateral agreement between the affected territory and the national government as approved by Parliament speaking on behalf of all Canadians. This is the only just route in a democratic Canadian state the right of people to self-determination.

The Chair: If you want to conclude—

Mr Siddiqui: There are just a few more points I would like to emphasize.

Reflecting on another subject, that is, the discussion of immigration, the advisory committee wants to indicate that provincial opting out may be used as a panacea for difficult substantive issues as demonstrated in the 1987 constitutional accord again. The level of quality of services provided to foster the linguistic and cultural integration of new Canadians may be jeopardized if a decentralization of immigration on provincial lines occurs. The absence of any national standards—and this is a point that Ontario must adhere to—and/or defined guidelines for provincial services may result in unacceptable variations in services in that situation.

Any discussion on the guaranteed percentage of immigrants to Quebec is unclear in both intention and enforceability, if that is the route we do proceed in the future. Furthermore, unresolved issues may remain regarding how that percentage will be met. Undefined criteria as to where Quebec would recruit newcomers, what criteria would be used, what accessibility would be established for those whose mother tongue is not French must be developed. A related issue is the extent to which other provinces will develop reactive policies to Quebec's pro-French-language stance.

I will conclude on that note. Essentially, one last point that we would like to make is that with regard to the future of Canada, we envisage that both Canada and Ontario are distinct societies in that context, one composed of people originally from many diverse backgrounds and different parts of the world. To ignore this fact is to ignore the reality of the Ontario and Quebec we live in today, a land whose founding members are native and aboriginal peoples, a land which boasts proud English and French cultural traditions, a land which boasted even richer legacies from other parts of the world and which has enshrined this fact in a multiculturalism act. This is the Canada of today and the Canada of tomorrow. This is the Canada whose future we have to work for together.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Siddiqui. We will move on to the next presentation.

ASSOCIATION DES ENSEIGNANTES ET DES ENSEIGNANTS FRANCO-ONTARIENS

M. le Président : Je voudrais inviter Robert Millaire, de l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens.

M. Millaire : Bonjour. Au nom de l'AEFO, l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens, j'aimerais vous remercier d'avoir accepté de nous entendre aujourd'hui. Je crois que ce processus de consultation est extrêmement important dans les futures discussions qui vont avoir lieu sur le débat constitutionnel. Nous maintenons que l'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle très important dans les futures discussions sur la constitution.

L'AEFO représente les enseignantes et les enseignants qui oeuvrent dans les écoles de langue française partout en Ontario. Nous avons 7000 membres qui entrent dans les écoles de langue française à travers la province. Par son biais de l'éducation, l'AEFO est intimement liée aux

aspirations de la communauté francophone. L'AEFO a été très active dans le passé pour faire la promotion des droits de la francophonie.

Basé sur ces énoncés, je vais faire le commentaire suivant : la communauté francophone de l'Ontario se considère comme une entité culturelle faisant partie intégrante de l'Ontario. Cette prémisse constitue la pierre angulaire de toutes les thèses et propositions que nous formulons pour répondre aux besoins et aux attentes de la communauté francophone en Ontario. Je pourrais faire maintenant, au début de votre texte, les pages jaunes, les faits saillants de notre présentation.

1540

1. L'AEFO considère comme essentiel la présence du Québec au sein de la Confédération canadienne. L'AEFO affirme que le retrait du Québec de la Confédération canadienne serait une expérience traumatisante, autant du point de vue social que du point de vue économique pour tout l'ensemble du Canada.

L'amputation de 25% à 30% de l'économie et du territoire d'un pays ne peut pas se faire sans effets secondaires. Pour l'AEFO, il n'y a aucun doute que la communauté francophone de l'Ontario vaut par elle-même. Elle ne justifie pas son existence à cause de la présence du Québec. Elle a su par ses efforts se prévaloir d'institutions et d'infrastructures minima pour son développement. Cependant, avec une vision réaliste, notre communauté considère que ses efforts devront être intensifiés pour conserver et améliorer ces infrastructures.

2. Une politique de bilinguisme officiel pour l'ensemble de la province devrait être adoptée par le gouvernement de l'Ontario. L'AEFO formule cette demande en s'appuyant sur le fait du profond attachement de la communauté francophone à l'Ontario et à ses efforts constants qui ont permis son développement jusqu'à ce jour. De plus, par rapport au débat constitutionnel, l'AEFO propose que l'on reconnaisse trois communautés nationales du Canada, dont les communautés autochtones, anglophone et francophone. Cette reconnaissance constitue un premier pas vers la résolution du débat linguistique. Pour concrétiser cette reconnaissance constitutionnelle, l'Ontario devrait établir un code invariable de reconnaissance du statut de sa collectivité francophone. Ce code servirait de pilier à la mise en place de la politique de bilinguisme officiel proposée par l'AEFO.

3. L'AEFO recommande que le gouvernement de l'Ontario joue un rôle proactif dans le débat constitutionnel sur la scène nationale. Fort de son expérience de leadership dans les débats constitutionnels antérieurs, et plus précisément celui de l'accord du Lac Meech, l'Ontario est en mesure de jouer un rôle prépondérant en ce qui a trait à la question constitutionnelle. L'AEFO croit que le gouvernement de l'Ontario, en déclarant une politique de bilinguisme officiel et en établissant un code de reconnaissance du statut de la communauté francophone en Ontario, exercera dans les faits son leadership et inspirera les autres provinces canadiennes.

Ce sens de leadership du gouvernement de l'Ontario peut aussi s'appliquer par rapport à la question économique et des disparités régionales. En portant une attention

particulière à ses propres régions victimes de disparités économiques régionales, le nord et l'est de l'Ontario, le gouvernement provincial peut mettre à profit la vigueur du développement économique de l'Ontario afin de résoudre ce problème de disparités. De plus, au niveau national, l'exemple stimulant et la source de richesses que représente l'Ontario sont d'une influence certaine quant à l'enrichissement du Canada dans son ensemble.

4. L'AEFO demande qu'un système d'éducation de langue française, du préscolaire au postsecondaire, soit établi en Ontario, garanti par mesures législatives et géré par les francophones. Parce que nous considérons le domaine de l'éducation comme la pierre angulaire du développement global de notre communauté francophone, la pleine gestion de nos réseaux scolaires permettra à notre communauté de répondre aux nouveaux défis économiques et technologiques qui s'imposent à l'ensemble de la population ontarienne. La communauté francophone de l'Ontario sera ainsi formée adéquatement afin qu'elle participe pleinement au développement général de sa province. La pleine actualisation de notre communauté représente un avantage économique et social incontesté pour l'ensemble de la province de l'Ontario.

Je vous réfère maintenant à la page 6 de votre document. Vous avez un schéma qui résume un peu les aspirations de notre présentation. En tenant en tête ce schéma, je vous réfère également à la page 14, où je vais réitérer les recommandations de l'AEFO.

L'AEFO recommande donc que le gouvernement de l'Ontario adopte une politique de bilinguisme officiel pour l'ensemble de la province. L'AEFO recommande, à la page 15, que l'Ontario dans les prochains débats constitutionnels travaille à ce que le Québec demeure à l'intérieur du Canada. L'AEFO recommande que le gouvernement de l'Ontario joue un rôle proactif dans le débat constitutionnel sur la scène nationale. Et, à la page 16, l'AEFO recommande qu'un système d'éducation de langue française, du préscolaire au postsecondaire, soit établi en Ontario, garanti par des mesures législatives et géré par les francophones.

Alors voilà nos recommandations. S'il y a des questions je suis prêt à y répondre.

M. le Président : Est-ce qu'il y a des questions? Non ? Merci.

The Chair : Could I call next Baljinder Gill from the National Association of Canadians of Origin in India. Not here yet? Okay.

FÉDÉRATION DES ASSOCIATIONS DE PARENTS FRANCOPHONES DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : Marguerite Yamasaki et Louise Pinet.

Mme Yamasaki : Bonjour, et nous vous remercions d'avoir accepté de nous entendre.

Les parents membres de la Fédération des associations de parents francophones de l'Ontario ont pour principal intérêt l'avenir de leurs enfants. Nous croyons en notre pays, le Canada, un pays qui s'étend d'un océan à l'autre, de l'Atlantique au Pacifique et à l'Arctique. Nous les parents voulons offrir à nos enfants un héritage complet. Il n'y a pas de gens plus intéressés que nous le sommes à ce

dossier. Nous avons la responsabilité de préserver l'héritage et le patrimoine ; nous avons la responsabilité d'assurer l'avenir.

Notre fédération sait que la solution aux difficultés actuelles ne réside pas dans un retour aux batailles anciennes. Oui, nous sommes inquiets de toute l'instabilité qui nous entoure, mais nous croyons que le Canada vaut la peine d'être maintenu. Malgré la situation instable, il n'en demeure pas moins que, aujourd'hui, lors de voyages à l'étranger, on reconnaît encore l'importance de notre pays. Nos jeunes sont fiers d'afficher le drapeau du Canada sur leur sac à dos car, disent-ils, les Canadiens sont bienvenus partout. Nous ne voulons pas d'un Canada amoindri.

En tant que parents francophones en Ontario, nous savons ce que ça veut dire de s'accommoder. Nous avons vécu la discrimination officialisée, nous connaissons l'injustice. Mais nous connaissons également le succès, les réalisations, les progrès, et c'est cela qui nous motive.

Malheureusement, dans certaines régions du pays on n'a pas encore tiré plein profit des avantages. Nous devons viser à éliminer les disparités qui persistent. Voilà vers quoi nous devons nous diriger.

En tant que parents, nous voulons que chacun de nos enfants ait l'occasion d'exceller sur tous les plans. Nous voulons que tous les Canadiens puissent bénéficier des avantages du pays. Dans son ensemble, le Canada est plus fort que ses provinces prises individuellement. Nous ne voulons pas que nos enfants vivent isolés, tant du point de vue linguistique que du point de vue économique. Nous ne voulons pas restreindre les frontières. Nous voulons un Canada où tous les Canadiens se sentiront chez eux, et cela dans toute l'étendue du territoire géographique, dans le respect des particularités de chaque citoyen.

Mais il ne faut pas minimiser la crise actuelle. Il ne faudrait surtout pas la considérer comme une simple crise d'adolescence. Il vaudrait mieux considérer qu'après 120 ans les besoins ont changé. Il faudrait voir à ce que toutes les provinces et territoires puissent bénéficier des avantages qu'offre le pays, et cela sans nuire à aucun d'eux ni à aucun de ses citoyens. Il faudrait s'assurer que toutes les provinces et territoires partagent les responsabilités d'un tel investissement. Nous devons essayer d'établir des ententes et des rapports communs qui seraient acceptables à tous.

1550

En tant que francophones en Ontario, nous sommes conscients que nous ne sommes pas les seuls francophones au Canada. En particulier nous pensons au grand nombre qui se trouvent au Québec et au Nouveau-Brunswick. Depuis toujours les francophones en Ontario ont participé à la vie économique, artistique et culturelle et cela dans tous les coins de la province. Nous pensons que la province de l'Ontario doit adopter les articles 16 à 20 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés et devenir une province officiellement bilingue. C'est le premier geste à poser. C'est le geste qui fera preuve d'équité et d'égalité.

Nous avons reçu de nos parents un héritage dont nous sommes fiers. Nous voulons le laisser à nos enfants en espérant qu'ils pourront faire de même pour les leurs.

M. le Président : Are there any questions? Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ?

M. Beer : Un bref commentaire, peut-être. Je pense qu'il est très important, comme vous l'avez souligné, dans l'éducation de vos enfants qu'on puisse développer des programmes scolaires pour les écoles de langue française et que ces programmes soient développés par des francophones. Au sein du ministère de l'Éducation je sais qu'il va être très important, en développant d'autres domaines, qu'on développe la capacité de garder un groupe de francophones qui ne traduisent pas les programmes tout simplement, mais qui développent vraiment ces programmes, que ce soit dans le domaine des sciences, des mathématiques ou quoique ce soit. Je pense que c'est un point important pour assurer la meilleure éducation possible aux francophones dans cette province.

Mme Yamasaki : C'est une nécessité absolue pour nous, que tout se transmette.

M. Bisson : Vous avez fait mention dans votre présentation qu'il ne faut pas sous-estimer la situation avec le Québec, avec les changements auxquels on y fait face. Beaucoup de monde regardent cela comme crise d'adolescent mais vous avez dit dans votre mémoire qu'on ne peut pas le regarder en ces termes. Quels changements est-ce que vous, comme individu et comme groupe, pensez qu'il faut envisager en tant que pays vis-à-vis de la constitution ? Des changements de pouvoir au niveau des provinces et au fédéral ? C'est quoi votre vision ? Qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire pour faire face à ces problèmes ?

Mme Yamasaki : Au cours de l'été dernier j'ai suivi les débats à la télévision. J'ai cru voir un marathon. C'était comme si tout le monde était pressé, pris à la dernière minute. Je pense qu'il est temps qu'on s'arrête vraiment, qu'on étudie à fond tous les problèmes parce que les marathons se font dans la course et les sports, pas dans une question constitutionnelle.

MARY JACKSON

The Chair: Could I call next Mary Jackson from the Capital Region Centre for the Hearing Impaired, I believe.

Mrs Jackson: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am the deaf president of the deaf centre. My name is Mary Jackson and sitting next to me is Betty Tigwell, who is also deaf, and she is an American sign language instructor. On behalf of the Capital Region Centre for the Hearing Impaired, it is my pleasure to give you this presentation this afternoon.

Historically in our nation the statutes form the main part of the nation's political Constitution, a Confederation consisting of a federal Parliament and a number of provincial legislatures with power divided between them in a specific way.

We need some strong legislation to provide us, the deaf population, as well as other disabled persons, better access to reasonable accommodation. That may include providing interpreters, telephone devices for the deaf, telephone handset amplifiers, telephones compatible with hearing aids, TV decoders, visual emergency alarms and ramps

in buildings such as residential dwellings and commercial facilities.

The Americans With Disabilities Act, or the ADA, was signed into law in Washington, DC, last summer, 26 July 1990, and it is expected to have a tremendous impact on America's deaf and hard-of-hearing population, as well as persons with other disabilities. We need a bill like this in Canada. Such a bill would provide civil rights protection to all Canadians with disabilities, including deaf and hard-of-hearing persons. Various sections of the new act would benefit us in the following areas, employment, telephone message relay services, 911 telecommunications device for the deaf access and closed-captioning.

Such a new law, similar to the ADA, would be a wonderful beginning for serving the needs and also for realizing the possibilities of all human beings.

Key features of provincially legislated human rights should be taken into consideration for some review, and this should be done in order to ensure that the interpretations of specific clauses are clearly understood relating to some areas such as reasonable accommodation, undue hardship, education rights, barrier-free employment.

Conclusively, such a new bill similar to the ADA would be a good influence on bylaws/amendments within municipalities in order to provide disabled citizens with better access to service related to their daily life needs, and those needs are things such as the provision of ramps, wheelchairs and transportation.

In closing, please permit me to leave with you a summary of what the Americans With Disabilities Act will do for deaf citizens in the United States, and I urge this committee to take this into consideration when formulating your conclusions and recommendations.

I would like to ask Betty to add a few words.

1600

Ms Tigwell: I would like to talk a little bit about education, and that follows some of what Mary was saying. I that we should make sure that American sign language is provided in the schools and that it be used as a language of instruction because it is a much better means of educating deaf people. It is a language equal to that language used in schools for hearing people.

We have to also see larger number of interpreters. We do not have enough interpreters for ASL and also for LSQ. In Quebec there are only a small number of interpreters, and I think that across the province we have to make sure that interpreters are provided. We have to make sure that American sign language is allowed, it is a part of the system. Deaf people take language in visually and it must be accessible to them, and I would urge you to remember that. Thank you very much.

Mr Malkowski: You were talking about the number of deaf people who live in Quebec moving. Do you notice a large number of deaf people from Quebec moving to Ontario because of services?

Ms Tigwell: Well, in Quebec there are very few LSQ interpreters, so often they come here. But again, there are inadequate numbers of interpreters in Ontario. There may be some in the school system, but there are very

few interpreters, and that is a real need. We have to make sure that we see increased numbers.

Mrs Jackson: That is correct. Interpreter services are very small and the LSQ interpreters we have tend to move back to Montreal, so we need to see a better balance of services for francophone and anglophone deaf.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

MOUVEMENT DES CAISSES POPULAIRES DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : I call next Benoît Martin, du Mouvement des caisses populaires de l'Ontario.

M. Martin : Messieurs et mesdames les commissaires, permettez-moi en premier lieu de vous remercier, remercier le gouvernement ontarien de nous avoir invités à cette consultation pour exprimer notre point de vue sur la participation de notre province au débat national sur l'avenir de notre pays. Le Mouvement des caisses populaires de l'Ontario est heureux de présenter son point de vue sur l'avenir politique et constitutionnel de l'Ontario.

Les caisses populaires, seules institutions financières entièrement francophones en Ontario, existent depuis 1912 et ont toujours été étroitement liées au développement économique et social des Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes. Le Mouvement des caisses populaires de l'Ontario regroupe plus de 60 caisses populaires réparties à travers la province, dont les actifs totalisent plus de 1,5 milliard de dollars. Nous comptons plus de 450 dirigeants et dirigeantes élus démocratiquement et provenant de toutes les couches de la société et plus de 800 employés offrant à nos 250 000 Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes membres de caisses des services financiers en français.

La mission du Mouvement étant de contribuer à l'épanouissement économique et socioculturel des Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes, nous ne pouvons passer sous silence les difficultés et les embûches quotidiennes que nous rencontrons dans l'atteinte de ces objectifs.

En dépit du fait que la constitution garantit aux francophones le droit à leur langue et cela partout au Canada, il est évident que tous les francophones, peu importe où ils se situent au Canada, ont de la difficulté à vivre ces droits. Le Canada anglais comprend difficilement les revendications autonomistes des francophones, que ce soit le Québec face au Canada — et l'accord du Lac Meech en est un exemple frappant — ou les francophones hors Québec, ceux de l'Ontario, du Manitoba, du Nouveau-Brunswick qui revendiquent tous à l'intérieur de leur province respective une plus grande autonomie dans la gestion de leurs affaires, de meilleurs services gouvernementaux en français et surtout la création d'institutions francophones propres aux francophones.

Plus souvent qu'autrement, pour ne pas dire toujours, ces revendications se butent à un refus obstiné de reconnaître ces droits historiques et fondamentaux des francophones. Cette situation est d'abord nettement confirmée en maints domaines dans lesquels les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes sont privés de pouvoirs d'action essentielles à leur protection, telles les communications, l'éducation supérieure et l'économie, ou pour lesquels ils ne reçoivent pas leur juste part du soutien provincial, telles

la redistribution des taxes, de subventions et autres. Cependant, nous reconnaissons un certain progrès avec l'adoption de la Loi sur les services en français.

La situation des Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes face à l'Ontario n'est pas différente de celle du Québec face au Canada. En effet, la majorité anglophone semble réticente à favoriser les aspirations des francophones de vouloir vivre en français à tout prix. Le fait français ne peut s'épanouir qu'à l'intérieur d'un milieu francophone, d'où la nécessité pour les francophones de posséder leurs propres institutions et surtout d'en assurer le contrôle. Ces revendications ne sont pas un caprice, elles sont essentielles à la survie du français en Ontario comme partout ailleurs au Canada.

Nous comprenons le désir des Québécois et Québécoises de faire reconnaître le caractère distinct de la société québécoise au sein de la Confédération. Le Québec veut pouvoir survivre en tant que tel et entend se doter des outils nécessaires à la réalisation de son mode de vie.

Nous, Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes, profitons de l'occasion unique que nous offre la commission Silipo pour vous sensibiliser, messieurs et mesdames les commissaires, qui aurez à conseiller notre premier ministre Bob Rae à l'urgence pour l'Ontario de reconnaître cette nécessité vitale de doter la communauté francophone de cette province de tous les outils nécessaires et revendiqués pour son épanouissement.

Je vous pose la question : comment la province de l'Ontario peut-elle espérer assumer son leadership au sein du débat constitutionnel si elle ne fait pas la preuve qu'elle est en mesure de comprendre les revendications de sa propre communauté francophone ? Il ne suffit pas d'instruire une population en français. Encore faut-il que cette population puisse vivre et travailler en français. Et cette réalité passe par la création d'institutions francophones gérées par des francophones.

À défaut de saisir ce besoin vital des francophones de vivre en français et à défaut de voir la majorité anglophone saisir cette richesse des deux cultures canadiennes, on risque de voir le Canada se déchirer. Il serait si simple de reconnaître une fois pour toutes ces droits que la constitution canadienne accorde aux francophones, mais surtout d'accepter que ces derniers aient aussi le droit de posséder et contrôler tous les leviers économiques, sociaux et administratifs nécessaires pour qu'ils puissent réaliser eux-mêmes leurs aspirations légitimes par les moyens qui leur conviennent.

S'il n'avait été de l'acharnement héroïque de nos pionniers, nous n'existerions probablement plus à l'heure actuelle. Il nous faut constamment être attentifs et vigilants vis-à-vis chacun des gestes posés par nos gouvernements afin de nous assurer que les acquis, si durement gagnés, ne soient pas diminués ou tout simplement retirés. Du Règlement 17, qui interdisait l'enseignement du français dans les écoles, jusqu'à l'accent sur le nom d'une ville, les gouvernements tentent constamment d'handicaper les efforts louables d'une communauté qui ne demande que de bien servir sa province et d'en recevoir le juste respect de sa langue et de sa culture.

Vous ne réalisez sans doute pas que le réseau des caisses populaires opère en Ontario strictement en français. Pour nous c'est une question de survie. Même le bilinguisme risquerait de contribuer, à moyen terme, à accélérer le taux d'assimilation de nos membres de caisses. Le Mouvement veut ainsi protéger son caractère francophone et se veut l'un des défenseurs de la langue française en Ontario. Or, il est évident que les gouvernements successifs n'ont pas encore compris ce caractère distinctif qui est le nôtre.

Saviez-vous que notre mouvement revendique depuis plus de cinq ans une plus grande autonomie de gestion en français, avec l'établissement d'un fonds de sécurité pour nos caisses ? Et pourtant, les gouvernements font la sourde oreille. Pourquoi une telle attitude ? Pourquoi nous obliger à utiliser la langue de Shakespeare puisqu'aucun cadre supérieur de l'Ontario Share and Deposit Insurance Corporation ne s'exprime en français. Pourtant, un fonds de sécurité francophone ne coûterait absolument rien au gouvernement puisque nous acceptons de le financer à 100%.

Serait-on opposé à la création d'emplois francophones dans cette province ? Ou serait-ce tout simplement une incompréhension pure et simple de nos aspirations légitimes ? Notre Mouvement des caisses populaires de l'Ontario est la plus belle réussite économique des Franco-Ontariens. Nous avons fait la preuve que nous avons non seulement une solidité financière exemplaire, avec plus de 57 millions de dollars en réserve, mais surtout que nous étions et que nous sommes très bien gérés. Nous estimons qu'une plus grande autonomie de gestion permettrait aux caisses populaires de l'Ontario d'économiser plus de 1,5 million de dollars par année. Cet argent est essentiel pour assurer notre développement futur et à défaut d'obtenir cette autonomie à court terme, c'est le développement de toute la francophonie en Ontario qui en souffrira.

1610

Permettez-moi, en guise de conclusion, de reprendre les paroles mêmes de notre premier ministre, Bob Rae : « Nous devons changer considérablement la façon dont au Canada nous partageons les pouvoirs, préparons l'avenir et prenons des décisions sur les questions économiques et sociales comme gouvernements et comme individus ». Ceci est tiré des déclarations de l'Assemblée législative le 19 décembre 1990.

Pour nous, ces paroles signifient que pour coexister, les anglophones et les francophones de ce pays, que ce soit le Québec face au Canada ou la situation des Franco-Ontariens et des Franco-Ontariennes à l'intérieur de leur propre province, doivent approuver leur diversité et en respecter leur spécificité. Pour s'épanouir, le fait français a besoin de la compréhension de la majorité anglophone de ce pays et cette dernière devra accepter de partager ces pouvoirs.

Partout dans le monde, l'heure est au changement. La structure canadienne n'y échappe pas et elle doit être repensée tant du point de vue politique, économique que social. Pour ce faire, les gouvernements doivent être à l'affût des besoins distincts des trois peuples fondateurs du Canada : les autochtones, les francophones et les anglophones. Ils doivent dès maintenant commencer à négocier ce nouveau Canada et démontrer leur ferme volonté de sauvegarder la coexistence de ces regroupements.

La province de l'Ontario, étant la première province du Canada, tant par sa population que par sa richesse, se doit d'assurer le leadership dans cette matière. Elle doit assumer cette responsabilité non seulement par ses attitudes vis-à-vis sa communauté franco-ontarienne, mais surtout par son pouvoir d'influencer les autres provinces pour que ces dernières saisissent bien les aspirations légitimes des francophones de ce pays. C'est à ce prix que l'unité du Canada sera sauvegardée.

La province de l'Ontario ne côtoie pas le Québec seulement géographiquement mais elle partage également avec ce dernier des ententes commerciales et autres qui font de ces deux provinces une force économique importante pour le Canada. De plus, l'Ontario compte la plus forte communauté francophone hors Québec, ce qui lui assure une compréhension unique au débat constitutionnel qui s'annonce et par voie de conséquence, une meilleure crédibilité au sein de la communauté anglophone du pays.

Tel le Nouveau-Brunswick, l'Ontario se doit de reconnaître la langue française et de plus insister fortement pour que cette juste reconnaissance fasse partie intégrante du renouvellement constitutionnel.

En terminant, le Mouvement des caisses populaires souhaite que le présent mémoire soit utile à la commission et remercie cette dernière d'avoir bien voulu l'entendre. Merci.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Martin. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ? Are there any questions ?

M. Beer : Juste une question. C'est au sujet de cette question des caisses et du fonds de sécurité. Je sais que c'était toujours un sujet de discussion quand nous étions au pouvoir et je dois dire que je n'ai jamais complètement compris toutes les raisons pour le problème. Est-ce que c'est toujours à l'ordre du jour du gouvernement ? Où est-ce que cette question reste ? Je pense que vous avez fait dans votre présentation un bon argument pour changer le système actuel, mais quel est le problème clé ?

M. Martin : Je pense que le problème qui existe présentement est au niveau des priorités gouvernementales. Je crois que le ministre des Institutions financières a peut-être d'autres problèmes soi-disant plus prioritaires, mais passé avril je pense que le gouvernement se rattachera un peu plus près de notre problème. On était censé le régler l'année dernière, mais avec les changements gouvernementaux ça a été retardé encore une fois, alors on espère bien que la commission intercédera.

M. Beer : On va en parler avec nos collègues de l'autre côté.

CORPORATION DE LA VILLE DE HAWKESBURY

M. le Président : J'appelle maintenant Yves Drouin, le maire de la ville de Hawkesbury.

M. Drouin : Monsieur le Président, chers membres du comité, mon nom est Yves Drouin et je suis de la onzième génération de Drouin au Canada. Mon fils Mathieu est de la cinquième génération de Franco-Ontariens. Je suis aussi maire de Hawkesbury et au nom des citoyens et citoyennes de la ville de Hawkesbury, je désire vous remercier d'avoir accepté de nous recevoir aujourd'hui.

L'Ontario, la province la plus peuplée du Canada a, à n'en pas douter, un rôle clé à jouer dans la redéfinition du Canada. En ce sens, la mise sur pied de ce comité spécial arrive à point.

Last year, during what some have called the winter of the unilingual crisis in Ontario, our city made a leap forward. Rather than declaring itself a unilingual city, Hawkesbury boldly chose to officially become a bilingual city. In a nutshell, this action is an accurate reflection of who and what we are: proud Canadians, tolerant people and citizens who strive to find a way to accommodate the two official linguistic groups in this richly diverse country.

Hawkesbury est fière d'être une ville bilingue. Alors que la population canadienne utilise l'anglais comme langue de communication à 75% et le français à 25%, nos proportions sont à peu près l'inverse. Le Canada tout entier semble croire qu'il est impossible de relever les défis que nous présente notre réalité linguistique. Nous à Hawkesbury croyons, bien au contraire, que notre situation linguistique n'est pas un problème mais plutôt un atout, une force et un outil de développement socioéconomique et culturel pour tout l'Ontario et le Canada.

Trop souvent, l'Ontario semble oublier qu'à l'extrême est de ses frontières existe une région dont la ville principale est Hawkesbury. Le journal l'Ottawa Citizen, dans son autopublicité, demande si Queen's Park sait où est situé Ottawa. Cette petite question nous amuse à Hawkesbury. Nous savons que vous savez où se trouve Ottawa, mais savez-vous qu'à moins de 100 kilomètres d'Ottawa il existe une ville appelée Hawkesbury ? Lorsque le gouvernement ontarien, en collaboration avec le gouvernement fédéral, a annoncé en 1989 la mise sur pied du premier collège communautaire de langue française, avec campus à Cornwall et à Ottawa, deux villes à forte majorité anglophone, nous ne nous sommes pas laissés démoraliser, car nous savions que nous avions beaucoup de ressources à offrir. Nous pouvons, entre autres, offrir un milieu de vie unique en français que virtuellement aucune autre région de la province ne peut offrir.

Nous avons revendiqué avec fierté cet atout et l'ensemble des ressources dont nous disposons et c'est ainsi que nous avons obtenu notre campus de la Cité collégiale. Maintenant nous attendons que le gouvernement de l'Ontario accorde un financement réaliste à ce campus et au Centre des métiers qui en fera partie.

L'Ontario a su profiter durant son histoire de nombreux avantages. Bien situé géographiquement au centre du Canada, assuré d'un accès direct aux riches marchés américains, profitant d'une main-d'œuvre diversifiée, étant ainsi devenu le cœur de l'industrie manufacturière canadienne, l'Ontario est la province la plus riche et la plus puissante de la Confédération. Aujourd'hui, cette Confédération est menacée et le monde économique qui l'a si bien servie est en profonde restructuration. Le Canada est en voie de se désintégrer et l'économie mondiale est en voie de se globaliser.

Dans ce contexte et à cette période critique de notre histoire, l'Ontario a su saisir l'opportunité de venir en aide à notre pays en mettant sur pied un comité d'étude et de consultation tel que le vôtre. Votre mandat le dit très bien.

The mandate that has been entrusted to your committee is one we take seriously. In addressing both questions, which are of fundamental importance to the future of our country and our province, we would first like to say that in order to protect and promote the social and economic interests and aspirations of all Ontarians, the Ontario government must play a proactive role in saving our country from the crisis it now faces.

The disintegration of our national fabric can only bring serious harm to our province. Over the years, Ontario and Quebec have developed and enjoyed strong economic links that must be preserved at all costs. If, for instance, Quebec decides it has no other choice but to sever its ties with Canada, there is no doubt in our minds that this would cause irreparable harm to all concerned.

1620

Il est évident que le Canada tel que nous l'avons connu est déjà chose du passé. Il nous faut donc une nouvelle forme de confédération. Nous ne sommes pas des constitutionnalistes, mais nos expériences et nos connaissances nous permettent d'affirmer avec conviction que nous devons reconnaître, protéger et promouvoir les droits des premiers citoyens du Canada, les autochtones. Nous devons partout au pays reconnaître, protéger et promouvoir les droit des communautés linguistiques de langue officielle. Nous devons trouver les moyens qui permettront aux francophones et aux anglophones et aux autochtones de se sentir à l'aise au sein de notre pays, de s'épanouir et de servir le pays avec fierté. Nous devons reconnaître et promouvoir l'héritage multiculturelle de notre pays. Nous devons permettre à chacune des régions de notre pays de se donner les moyens d'agrandir et de contribuer à l'ensemble du pays.

Canadians have but one certainty today: We cannot go back to the Canada we once knew. Change is the order of the day. If making changes means granting a greater degree of autonomy to Quebec—or to any other province, for that matter—we say let's do it. This whole crisis is not and should not be about the division of powers between the federal and the provincial governments. The heart of the matter, the real issue, is the existence of our country. We are firmly convinced that our country can exist under an other type of formula than the one that has served us since Confederation.

Behind this crisis, however, that has been tearing us apart for years, there is an even more serious issue. While Canadians from all parts of the country are desperately searching for a new identity and continue to fight their way out of this dangerous constitutional quicksand, our world is slowly but surely becoming a global village, and this globalization phenomenon is seriously overtaking our world economy.

These fundamental changes to our world are bringing a new era and a new way of doing business across the many continents. For example, how can we possibly think of developing new markets and finding new growth opportunities when we are continuously engaging in constitutional debates that require most of our energies and resources? If we want to ensure a dynamic and prosperous future for

Canada and Ontario, we must start using all of our resources to develop new economic opportunities.

We, the citizens of Hawkesbury, do not pretend to have all the answers in this regard, but we do know this. Our chief resource, people, is not being used to its full potential.

Nous pourrions citer de nombreux exemples. Nous préférons toutefois en utiliser un qui est plus près de nous. L'Ontario a l'unique chance de voir coexister sur son propre territoire deux langues des plus utilisées au monde, l'anglais et le français. Nous à Hawkesbury savons à quel point la possession de ces deux langues peut être importante ; notre ville est une des villes les plus bilingues au pays avec un taux de bilinguisme de 90%. Toutefois, cette grande ressource, même chez nous, est mal utilisée parce que, entre autres choses, notre population francophone n'a pas accès à une éducation postsecondaire dans sa langue. Nos industries doivent se rendre au Québec et parfois ailleurs dans le monde pour trouver des spécialistes. On nous répondra que la Cité collégiale est là pour ça, sauf que la Cité collégiale n'offre pas de centre de métiers touchant des domaines tels les sciences de la santé, la gestion, les arts et la culture. Nos étudiants et étudiantes doivent aller étudier ailleurs. Malheureusement, plusieurs d'entre eux ne reviendront pas.

Our message is simple: Ontario's francophone population has a lot to offer Canada and the province. We Franco-Ontarians can be a tremendous asset in helping Ontario develop new markets the world over. Among other things, we speak one of the two languages most often used in the world, the French language. But to help Ontario do this, we need help from Ontario. We need the tools and the development mechanism that will put us in a situation to contribute fully to our province's growth and future. We need educational tools such as the French-language community college that was created in Ottawa in 1989, a campus in Hawesbury fully equipped to develop our people. Those are the kinds of tools that can help us help you. The French Language Services Act of 1986 was a start. We must go even further still. Our future depends on it.

Les francophones de cette province, comme les francophones des autres provinces et les anglophones du Québec, sont l'une des principales ressources de ce pays. Malheureusement, une petite minorité aimerait pouvoir leur enlever leurs droits qu'ils ont si durement acquis et les renvoyer «chez eux». Chez nous, c'est ici en Ontario. Nous sommes ici pour rester et nous voulons bâtir un Ontario compétitif et un Canada meilleur.

Le Canada, à n'en pas douter, est à la croisée des chemins. Nous sommes présentement à faire des choix qui détermineront notre avenir. Ce processus a toutefois très mal débuté. Depuis le 23 juin dernier, si l'on se fie aux médias, les Canadiens et Canadiennes semblent avoir décidé de s'autodétruire, de se livrer à un suicide collectif. Au Canada anglais, on entend presque quotidiennement des «Let them go» ; au Québec on regarde le pays comme s'il était l'ennemi juré.

À Hawkesbury, nous nous retrouvons littéralement à la frontière de ce phénomène. Située à quelques minutes du Québec et à une heure de Montréal et composée d'une importante minorité anglophone, notre ville subit presque

quotidiennement les soubresauts d'une incertitude constitutionnelle qui perdure. Nos anglophones, comme nos francophones, sont inquiets de l'avenir.

Nous savons aussi toutefois que, quoiqu'il arrive, Hawkesbury et ses citoyens et citoyennes seront toujours en Ontario au lendemain des grandes décisions, qu'ils vivront toujours ensemble, que le Québec sera toujours juste un pont plus loin que Montréal et que Montréal ne changera pas d'emplacement. Nous savons que, quoiqu'il arrive, nous continuerons à être un pont entre l'Ontario et le Québec.

We want to live in a strong and united Canada. As Canadians, we know that the disintegration of our country will cost us dearly and in more ways than one. We also know that we must be prepared to make important change in the way we have been relating to each other as Canadians and as a nation.

L'Ontario doit d'abord s'assurer d'être l'un des principaux chefs de file dans la réalisation de ces changements. Il est important que la province s'assure de jouer un rôle de médiateur dans le débat qui s'enclenche. L'Ontario et le Québec partagent une histoire commune qui remonte à presque 200 ans. Plusieurs choses nous unissent, entre autres des relations économiques extrêmement importantes. Durant le désormais célèbre débat sur l'accord du Lac Meech, par exemple, l'Ontario s'est assuré de maintenir des liaisons de communication constantes avec le Québec. C'est là un rôle que l'Ontario se doit de continuer à jouer. D'autre part, l'Ontario doit aussi s'assurer que les points de vue des autres groupes, régions et provinces soient entendus et écoutés. Si l'on veut que le Canada survive, il va nous falloir écouter beaucoup au cours des prochains mois.

At this key moment in our history, Ontario, if it wants, can seize the unique opportunity of being a role model. At a time when intolerance, unwillingness and rigidity seem to predominate, Ontario could and should adopt the role of the big brother and show the way to a more tolerant, open and peaceful society. One of the ways in which we can achieve this is by adopting a code of rights for its minorities and developing the appropriate policies that would serve to enforce it.

Grâce à ces deux grands axes, médiation et respect des droits des minorités, l'Ontario pourrait avoir la certitude que, quoiqu'il arrive, notre province serait vue comme celle qui a tout fait pour sauver le pays. Par la suite, les liens qu'elle aurait à établir avec le reste du pays seraient d'autant plus faciles à négocier.

1630

Enfin, l'Ontario doit prendre conscience que, en fonction de l'avenir incertain qui nous attend, sa population francophone devient un élément clé dans son positionnement. Le Québec, souverain ou non, ne partira pas à la dérive dans le golfe du Saint-Laurent. Nous continuerons, comme Ontariens et Ontariennes, à entretenir des liens économiques, sociaux et culturels très étroits avec les Québécois. La province aura donc grand besoin des francophones pour assurer des liens solides entre les deux provinces. Pour ce faire, il faut que l'Ontario reconnaisse officiellement sa population francophone et qu'elle lui donne les moyens de servir sa province et son pays.

En conclusion, en prenant ces mesures l'Ontario aura fait tout son possible pour tenter de nous sortir indemne de la crise actuelle. Ce faisant, peut-être pourrions-nous éviter aussi la malheureuse erreur commise en 1980. Si, après le référendum de 1980, les provinces canadiennes avaient reconnu les droits de leurs minorités linguistiques, comme on l'a fait en Ontario et comme Hawkesbury l'a fait pour sa population anglophone, il est fort possible que nous aurions pu éviter la crise qui nous déchire aujourd'hui.

Dans toute cette question, il importe de garder à l'esprit un élément fondamental : les autochtones, les francophones, les anglophones et la communauté multiculturelle de ce pays désirent d'abord et avant tout se sentir à l'aise dans ce pays, s'épanouir pleinement et pouvoir être citoyens et citoyennes à part entière.

In our humble view, a crisis can also be an opportunity for change and growth. Ontario has always played a vital role in this country. More than ever before, its leadership is a key to the impasse that Canada and its respective provinces and territories seem to have reached in finding ways of accommodating this richly diverse nation.

Nous, citoyens et citoyennes de Hawkesbury, partageons ce désir par dessus tout et souhaitons avoir l'occasion de contribuer pleinement à la société ontarienne et au Canada tout entier.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Drouin, d'avoir partagé avec nous le point de vue de votre ville et particulièrement votre position dans le contexte de la géographie mais aussi dans le contexte de notre pays.

Mr Beer: One thing I would like to mention with Mayor Drouin here is the role Hawkesbury has always played in terms of the anglophone and francophone communities; you note that your municipality has declared itself bilingual. I think people forget sometimes that a year ago, in fact, there was something in the order of 50 or 60 municipalities, here in the east and in the northeast in particular, which have done that. Indeed, in this very room in which we are sitting, the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton operates in both languages. It is something we should remember, that there are many Ontarians out there who felt there was another way and that their communities could operate bilingually. Your municipality has always taken the lead and I am delighted that you were able to come before us and give us that message.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

OTTAWA-CARLETON BOARD OF TRADE

The Chair: Could I invite next Michael Teeter from the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade?

Mr Teeter: My name is Michael Teeter. I have with me Bernie Dueck, who is also a member of the committee. We are here representing the Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade, which is the voice of business for this region. We have approximately 1,600 members, representing small, medium and large businesses in our community.

Over the past 10 years the business growth in our region has been rather impressive, in our view; in fact, the business community has been responsible for nearly all the population growth that has existed in this region. The

major business sectors in our region are high-technology, hospitality industries, retail and light manufacturing. Unbeknown to many, the federal government has been a declining influence in our region in terms of economic might in the last 10 years. The relative importance of federal government employment has declined. Ten years ago, federal government employment was approximately 32% of the region's workforce; today it accounts for less than 23%.

I do not want to give the impression that federal government employment is not important. Obviously, it is vital to our community, and I am only highlighting the fact that the business community has, I think, done an excellent job in making this region what it is today.

We are here, obviously, to discuss the future of Canada and to a lesser extent, though certainly important to us, the future of federal government in our region. This is what we will focus on to some extent in the rest of our comments.

First, we are somewhat dismayed by the fact that many Canadians are not as proud of or as supportive of our public service and the federal institutions in our nation's capital as they should be. We think this attitude is perhaps symptomatic of a deeper and disturbing malaise in our country. It is symptomatic of a nation that perhaps is beginning to disrespect itself a little. I welcome all of you to ask an American how he feels about his nation's capital and I am sure you will get a much different response from when you ask that question of many Canadians in this country.

From a business point of view, all this talk about how terrible the federal government is and the lack of pride in our country, at the same time as perhaps a downgrading or emasculating of what the nation's capital represents, we feel erodes business confidence generally.

These two things and all the other things associated with the political uncertainty brings with it, I think, a serious threat to our economic health and security as a nation.

As mentioned by others, the rest of the world seems to be breaking down barriers while Canada seems to be putting them up. We are intensely preoccupied with ourselves while we should be looking outwards and creating world-class businesses. We are focusing on those things that divide us and not on those values that we share in common.

All these things, of course, disturb us greatly as businessmen in this region. We are concerned about the future, and we would hope that the Ontario government, for its part, works very diligently to seek a fast and effective solution to all this political insecurity. Frankly, from my point of view, I am much more wedded to a fast solution than I am to any particular outcome, as a businessman, and I think there are many businessmen who feel the same way.

In our view, there are perhaps three serious options being considered in terms of the constitutional blueprint for the future. The status quo is not one of them. The first one is a substantial devolution of powers to the provincial governments, as the Allaire report pointed out; the second one perhaps is special status for Quebec, sovereign nation, whatever you want to call it; and a third one is the significant reform of power sharing and perhaps institution sharing between the provinces and the federal government and, in the process, perhaps taking some of the those shared

jurisdictions that currently exist and making them the exclusive domain of one level of government or the other.

Personally we support the third option. In our view the first option is the worst. A substantial devolution of powers is not something we would support at all, either from a regional perspective or because our members feel somewhat attached to Canada as a country and what it stands for and would feel strongly that the federal government should maintain all powers necessary to make Canada be what it stands for.

1640

At the same time as we support a reform of power sharing, we would also support a reform of democratic institutions, an elected Senate among other things, but also an ability for individuals, both MPs and individuals in society, to more fully affect the democratic process. There is a terrible degree in our view of disfranchisement today and a sense of frustration that a handful of people are destroying the country that we care for.

In fact I believe that if our democratic institutions had been reformed some time ago we would not be in the malaise we are in today, that if there truly was regional representation in power circles in this town, that if there was a real ability for individual legislators to influence the process rather than having it held so tightly in very few hands, the degree of disfranchisement either on a regional perspective or on an individual basis would not be what it is today. There would be a lot more satisfaction and a lot more confidence that the institutions we do have would be able to solve the problems of the future.

In terms of our own region and what might happen in the final analysis, it is possible indeed that our point of view, which is one of reform of powers between the provinces and the federal government but not necessarily a downsizing of federal government resources or a power devolution, just means a further clarity of what powers belong to whom. Assuming that our point of view is accepted, then we would not expect a radical effect on our region in terms of economic implications.

None the less, if we are wrong and there are transfers of revenues, tax points, powers, employees, etc, from the federal government to the province or government of Quebec or any other provincial governments for that matter, we would argue very strenuously for some kind of a transition period, a minimum of 10 years, and that there be specific economic adjustment programs for our region.

I think that, again getting back to this, we should not underestimate the importance of federal government employment to the 800,000-odd people who live in this region.

We also believe that overall federal decentralization commitments that continue today designed to transfer jobs and programs to places outside our region should be postponed indefinitely.

We would seek a more active participation of the Ontario government in the economic affairs of our region, particularly as it acts as the commercial centre for eastern Ontario. It has been my impression that the government of Ontario has assumed, certainly in today's time, perhaps a little bit incorrectly, that the federal government always looks after this region and that it therefore does not have a

significant role to play, but I would suggest that in times such as these it is time for the Ontario government to exercise some leadership in terms of our region.

Last we would seek some sort of commitment that any institutions required to manage a new Canadian federation be housed here, that they not be housed elsewhere.

The last two prescriptions have to do with any kind of change in power sharing and so on, and that these would go regardless of the outcome. They in fact are policy positions that we have today as the board of trade.

Trade barriers between provinces, for example, we do not believe should ever be permitted to exist regardless of what the outcome of constitutional discussions are and we would strongly support a standardization of tax and regulatory regimes between all provinces.

In closing I would just like to emphasize what our chairman said to me last night, and that is that we hope that at a time like this, the Ontario government might stand up and exercise some leadership on behalf of the people in Ontario to perhaps restore some of the lost confidence that we all feel at this time.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Teeter. There are some questions. We will try to get through as many as we can.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. Just in passing, when you talk about the trade barriers between provinces, you might be interested to know that many people have come before this committee and brought forward that particular message that we, as a province, and certainly all the provinces, should be looking at the reduction of trade barriers between the provinces.

My question deals with your membership. You have indicated you have 1,600 members and one of the things I would like to know is whether you, as the board of trade, are having any in-depth discussion with the membership on the issue, in terms of the impact of any of the potential models that you have already gone through and what it means to them, and also whether there is anything being done in terms of the province as a whole and boards of trade and chambers of commerce.

I think that that would be helpful to the committee. After saying that, my question is directed to the scenario which you have indicated you prefer, being a reform of power sharing in institutions between the provinces and the federal government. I was wondering if you might be able to share with us whether you feel the federal government should still, even in the event of a redistribution of power sharing, have some form of economic-type control over the provinces or whether you see some devolution in that area also.

Mr Teeter: Let me just talk a little bit about the consultation process, since you raised the subject. I would say that it is just beginning, and we in the national affairs committee have been perhaps a little bit more proactive in talking about the issue, because we believe that it would have a significant effect on the Ottawa-Carleton region. I am also vice-chairman of the board of trade and I have discussed it at the board level and at the executive committee level. The momentum is building to try to create, say, a

more broad consensus among the membership, as well as to gather data, as much as we can, as to what the impacts are.

In terms of the chambers of commerce generally, there are instruments in place to allow us to consult with other chambers of commerce through the Ontario Chamber of Commerce and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and so on. In fact the Ontario Chamber of Commerce's annual meeting is happening shortly. I know that it must be on the agenda somewhere, but we will have to make sure that it is. It must be.

Now, your second question about the specific economic powers that might or might not be transferred: I must confess that I have not done an in-depth analysis of all the power sharing of the powers that each level of government has, but in general I would support certainly a very strong presence for the federal government in all matters relating to monetary policy, to begin with, and obviously some control over fiscal policy too, because the spending powers, if they are transferred to the provinces as well, monetary policies in the federal government's hands, you may have the two acting at cross-purposes. So I would have to just say generally that I am a strong supporter of a stronger federal presence and stronger federal clarity of roles in all matters related to economic policy.

Bernie, do you have some comments?

Mr Dueck: Yes, I think I will follow with the no trade barriers between the provinces. Generally we would not support the devolution of economic powers to the provinces.

Mr Offer: Mr Chair, we might find out what is going to be on the agenda at the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce, because if there is going to be discussion—I know from past history that the agenda is usually circulated—any discussion which has taken place at the annual conference might be very helpful to this committee in terms of their looking at some of the economic ramifications of any of the models being proposed.

The Chair: Perhaps we can make sure that through our research people we get that information. It may be of use to us. Thank you very much then. We will move on.

J'appelle maintenant Jocelyne Beaulier du Cercle des femmes journalistes francophones. Non ? Françoise Viau ?

1650

FÉDÉRATION DES AÎNÉS DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : Monsieur Lécuyer.

M. Lécuyer : Bonjour, Monsieur le Président, membres de votre comité. À ma gauche est Françoise Viau, directrice générale de la fédération des aînés francophones de l'Ontario. Moi-même je suis André Lécuyer, président de la fédération. Nous vous remercions de nous avoir reçus aujourd'hui pour pouvoir dialoguer quelque peu sur un sujet qui nous intéresse tous puisque nous vivons dans cette province et que nous y vivons depuis très longtemps.

La Fédération des aînés francophones de l'Ontario existe depuis 1979, donc 12 ans. Elle regroupe les clubs et les centres de jour, tout près de 104 clubs et centres de jour, plus de 12 000 membres, et nous sommes ici non seulement pour représenter ces 12 000 membres mais pour

représenter les tout près de 42 000 aînés francophones de cette province. C'est à la page 3 du mémoire que vous avez devant vous.

Nous représentons plus que cela. Nous représentons toutes ces personnes qui sont nées dans les années 1900, qui ont vécu ici ou qui sont venus s'établir en Ontario. Nous représentons en plus cet esprit combatif de ces personnes, ceux mêmes qui ont combattu pour le maintien et l'établissement d'écoles de langue française primaires et secondaires, aussi bien que les nombreuses personnes qui ont fondé les associations pour la protection de la culture et de la langue française en Ontario, et de même, tous ces francophones aînés qui ont combattu pour la reconnaissance du fait français. Tout ce qui se passe en Ontario actuellement, je pense que nous pouvons le souligner avec fierté ; ce sont des faits et gestes de personnes de notre âge, de mon âge aussi bien que de personnes de 80 et de 90 ans.

Alors — à la page 3, dernier paragraphe — les personnes âgées ont planté racines dans cet Ontario et ce Canada. Nous sommes fiers de dire que nous sommes le deuxième peuple fondateur de cette province, après les autochtones bien sûr et avant les anglophones évidemment.

Nos pères, nos mères et nos arrière-parents sont venus s'installer sur le territoire ontarien 352 ans passés. C'est tout un héritage que nous portons. Tout comme nous respectons l'héritage du premier peuple fondateur, les autochtones, nous souhaitons que le troisième peuple fondateur, les anglophones, respectent notre existence et celle de nos descendants et de nos descendantes.

Qu'est-ce qu'une personne âgée francophone peut partager comme valeurs à titre de Canadien ou de Canadienne ? Nous pouvons partager ce que nous avons de plus cher, un respect et une reconnaissance pour toutes les grandes réalisations des deux autres peuples fondateurs. Nous aimerions que ce soit réciproque, que les anglophones puissent respecter et reconnaître tout, partout en Ontario et même au Canada, ce que nous et nos ancêtres avons fait pour le développement de cette province et du Canada. Nous aimerions partager cet héritage francophone du passé et la fierté possible d'un futur à titre de Canadiens et de Canadiennes.

Nous avons à vivre cette dualité linguistique qui a toujours existé et qui fait du Canada un pays spécial et quasi-unique. Sur les 25 millions d'habitants et d'habitantes dans ce pays, nous sommes 26% à descendre de l'ethnie française qui a trouvée sa source dans la création de ce pays.

L'autre 74% est composé de descendance multiethniques qui se servent de la langue anglaise majoritairement comme outil de communication. Une fois que chaque Ontarien et Ontarienne aura accepté cette diversité dans une forme d'unité, nous aurons alors des valeurs similaires à partager en tant que Canadiennes et Canadiens à part entière. Nous, personnes âgées de l'Ontario français, demandons d'être valorisées pour nos nombreuses contributions au développement de l'Ontario et nous aimerions partager des valeurs de fierté et de respect avec tous les Ontariens et toutes les Ontariennes de notre province. Quoi répondre à la question comment l'aîné francophone peut assurer l'avenir de la province de

l'Ontario au sein de l'économie mondiale, sauf peut-être avec une arrière-pensée un peu sarcastique ?

Dans ce territoire qui est devenu l'Ontario, les Français et les autochtones ont été les premiers à négocier des échanges commerciaux sur base internationale. On peut dire que c'est grâce à eux si on parle aujourd'hui d'échanges et d'avenir pour l'Ontario au sein de l'économie mondiale. Les précédents créés ont toujours été là pour justifier les gestes entrepris et à entreprendre. Ce sont les Hurons, ce peuple de commerçants, qui ont appris à nos ancêtres l'art du commerce mondial.

Nous, descendants et descendantes de ces ancêtres francophones, avons contribué autant que n'importe qui à la réussite de l'Ontario et du Canada sur la scène d'économie mondiale. Nous avons travaillé dans nos forêts, dans nos mines, dans nos industries, dans nos usines. Nous avons même contribué à la création d'entreprises multinationales et, venant de l'Ontario et venant de Sudbury, je crois que quelques noms en ressortent. Nous avons même créé certaines de ces entreprises.

Comment voulez-vous que le Canada ait réussi à assurer son avenir au sein de l'économie mondiale ? Il a cru essentiel de se définir comme pays bilingue pour s'offrir des ouvertures à l'étendue du globe. Il faut en tirer leçon et s'offrir, nous aussi de l'Ontario, un statut bilingue français-anglais pour être respectés davantage à l'échelle internationale. Si l'Ontario veut s'ouvrir de plus en plus sur le marché des peuples francophones — de la France, de la Belgique, de la Suisse, de l'Afrique, des Antilles — il va falloir que notre province suive l'exemple du Canada et se déclare officiellement bilingue pour recevoir une reconnaissance de ces pays.

Si l'Ontario veut profiter des talents de génie de nos descendances francophones, il va falloir que notre province nous offre plus de collèges et d'universités pour permettre une meilleure formation en français. Il est reconnu qu'on apprend mieux dans sa langue maternelle. Pourquoi les Desmarais et plusieurs autres Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes ont opté pour le Québec comme terre d'accueil pour leurs compagnies ? C'est très simple. Il y a beaucoup plus d'universités et de collèges bilingues qui peuvent leur offrir des économistes et des entrepreneurs et entrepreneuses qui peuvent s'adapter linguistiquement aux trois quarts des négociations économiques mondiales.

Si l'Ontario veut s'assurer d'un avenir au sein de l'économie mondiale, il va falloir qu'il soit au diapason de cette dualité linguistique internationale. La majeure partie de l'Europe travaille déjà en trois langues. Notre avenir ontarien dépendra d'au moins deux langues, le français et l'anglais. Comment pouvons-nous faire autrement si nous voulons vraiment faire partie d'un pays à deux langues officielles ?

En résumant, nous affirmons que la population francophone de l'Ontario a été un atout important dans l'évolution de la province sur la scène mondiale.

Il serait plus que possible de développer d'autres génies entrepreneurs et entrepreneuses francophones et de les garder en Ontario si nous avions des collèges et des universités français, comme le Québec s'est permis d'avoir

pour sauvegarder son pouvoir économique international, des collèges et des universités anglais.

Les Franco-Ontariens et les Franco-Ontariennes ont toujours été partie intégrante de cette participation au sein de l'économie mondiale. Il faut donc que la province de l'Ontario favorise davantage cette participation pour faire de notre province un pouvoir économique international. Avec votre permission, Monsieur le Président, je demanderais à M^{me} Viau de continuer.

1700

Mme Viau : À la question, quel rôle devrait jouer les gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux, vous faites une erreur. La question est trop vaste. On devrait se demander quel pouvoir devrait avoir l'Ontario dans un fédéralisme. L'Ontario devrait définitivement avoir plus de contrôle dans les domaines de la santé et des services publics. Il est évident que l'Ontario fait des progrès au niveau des services en français, mais pour mieux venir en aide aux aînés francophones, il nous faudrait des résidences francophones, et ce uniquement en français. Pour permettre à nos gens de bien finir leur vie, de bien s'adapter à cette dernière phase de leur existence, il faut avoir un peu de gratitude.

Il ne faut pas oublier qu'ils et elles ont fait leur part dans le développement de cette province. Nos personnes âgées méritent bien cette considération. Il ne faut pas oublier que d'ici l'an 2031 notre nombre aura doublé. Actuellement, la majorité des aînés doivent finir leurs jours dans des résidences anglophones. Est-ce vraiment avoir du respect ? Nous, la Fédération des aînés francophones de l'Ontario, demandons plus de résidences françaises par respect pour nos personnes âgées qui ont travaillé très fort afin de forger cet Ontario que nous connaissons.

Il est vrai qu'au Canada on ne rend pas justice aux autochtones, comme pose la question 4. Il est aussi vrai que dans la province de l'Ontario, on ne rend pas justice aux droits des francophones. C'est reconnu, les minorités ont toujours été défavorisées ; ça fait partie du côté sombre de notre histoire. L'Ontario, qui représente 38% de la population canadienne, a le devoir d'être le premier à rectifier ces injustices. Notre gouvernement doit devenir la figure de proue et rendre justice là où il se doit.

Il faut reconnaître officiellement ces deux peuples fondateurs qui sont devenus, avec les années, minoritaires. Il faut leur donner ce qui leur revient, reconnaître leurs droits. Tout revient une autre fois à cette question de respect, respect des autochtones, respect des francophones.

Reconnaître le droit à l'autodétermination et aux revendications territoriales des autochtones est une question de logique.

Reconnaître l'égalité linguistique du français et de l'anglais en Ontario est aussi une question de logique.

C'est en respectant cette base qu'on finira par comprendre ce qu'il faut vraiment faire pour garantir l'union dans un Canada.

La question sur les conflits linguistiques ne date pas d'aujourd'hui, croyez-nous. Nous le savons, nous les aînés francophones de l'Ontario et ce n'est pas une question d'émotivité comme vous le dites dans votre document de discussion, Changement et renouveau. C'est plutôt une

question de survie pour une culture, pour une langue, pour un peuple en voie d'extinction.

C'est encore cette question de manque de respect. Les aînés francophones de l'Ontario ont vécu et subi plus que les deux grandes guerres mondiales. Ils et elles se sont battus toute leur vie pour éviter le génocide culturel et linguistique qui semble être concocté par leur prochain. Une autre partie sombre de l'histoire de l'Ontario.

Comment voulons-nous un Canada bilingue et uni quand nous n'avons même pas une province bilingue et unie ? Le peuple franco-ontarien est un peuple fier, un peuple tenace. Il a réussi à survivre malgré les nombreuses pressions pour le faire disparaître. Imaginez-vous si toutes nos énergies franco-ontariennes avaient été investies uniquement pour développer l'Ontario ; nous aurions toute une province tant sur le plan international qu'à l'échelle nationale. Nous avons perdu beaucoup de temps, nous les aînés francophones, à vouloir défendre notre culture et notre langue. Elles ont perdu beaucoup de temps, les personnes âgées anglophones, à vouloir nous détruire. Il semble que l'union aurait pu faire la force dans notre province.

Comment voulez-vous l'unité au Canada quand la majorité des provinces n'emboîtent pas le pas sur cette reconnaissance nationale des deux langues officielles ?

M. Lécuyer : Le Canada n'est pas un melting pot et la langue française n'en est pas une parmi tant d'autres. C'est une des deux langues officielles et canadiennes. Aux autres peuples parlant le français, nous vous demandons de vous joindre à nous dans le respect de notre histoire, de nos racines et de nos droits acquis comme peuple fondateur. Ce droit n'est pas négociable et ne peut pas être abrogé.

Au stage où nous en sommes, l'avenir du Québec reste à être déterminé par le Québec comme l'avenir de l'Ontario reste à être déterminé par l'Ontario. Si toutes les provinces avaient suivi le pas du Canada en se déclarant bilingues, nous n'aurions pas à nous poser cette question : quel est l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada ? Il faut s'arrêter d'y penser. La réponse est pourtant simple. Le respect de l'un attire le respect de l'autre. Avec un respect mutuel, on développe l'amitié ; avec l'amitié on crée en retour l'union, et avec l'union on adhère à l'appartenance.

L'Ontario n'a qu'un geste de base à poser pour ouvrir les négociations sur l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada. Il doit démontrer une solidarité canadienne en acceptant les deux langues officielles de notre pays et ce par voie législative.

Comment voulez-vous qu'un peuple menacé ne se protège pas ? Le français a toujours été menacé au Canada et particulièrement en Ontario. Les deux plus grandes provinces, l'Ontario et le Québec, regroupent à elles seules 65% de la population canadienne. Il y a quasi autant de francophones que d'anglophones dans ces populations combinées. Il faut vraiment être sérieux et y penser.

La place de l'Ouest, du Nord et de la région de l'Atlantique au sein du Canada n'est vraiment pas une question. Il est tout à fait normal que l'ouest et l'est du Canada parlent de favoritisme pour le centre. Si cette philosophie de ne pas respecter ses minorités existe dans la mentalité générale du peuple ontarien, comment voulez-vous qu'en nombre minoritaire les deux extrémités du pays ne se sentent pas

défavorisées ? Même là c'est encore une question de respect. Il faut que cette attitude de supériorité cesse. La modestie et l'humilité doivent commencer à s'apprendre chez soi avant d'oser avoir la décence de vouloir les transporter ailleurs.

À l'ultime question, que veut l'Ontario, il est impossible pour la FAFO de répondre. Elle est trop générale, trop vague, tout comme la question que le Canada anglais s'est posé : What does Quebec want?

Les personnes âgées francophones de l'Ontario ne se posent pas la question : qu'est-ce que les francophones de l'Ontario veulent ? Ils et elles savent ce qu'ils et elles veulent et surtout ce dont ils et elles ont besoin. Voici ce que la Fédération des aînés francophones de l'Ontario veut et s'attend du gouvernement de l'Ontario :

que le gouvernement de l'Ontario apprenne à respecter ses minorités en mettant à leur disposition tous les services — santé, éducation, instruction — et ce, sans exception. C'est de mise pour en retour être respecté des autres gouvernements provinciaux ;

que le gouvernement de l'Ontario commence à faire des gestes concrets en acceptant légalement les deux langues officielles du Canada pour garantir un pas positif vers l'unité nationale. C'est la base de toute logique ;

que le gouvernement de l'Ontario favorise les programmes destinés aux personnes âgées francophones en leur donnant accès à des résidences françaises pour finir leurs jours dans la grâce et la dignité. C'est simplement un fait de reconnaissance pour le rôle que nous avons joué dans l'évolution de notre province ;

que le peuple anglophone du Canada commence à respecter le peuple francophone du Canada pour créer l'unité. Ce n'est qu'un geste normal et humain.

C'est en passant par des petits gestes concrets comme ceux-ci que l'Ontario aura sa place dans un Canada déjà défini comme étant un pays bilingue.

C'est main dans la main qu'on bâtit l'amitié, c'est par le respect de l'autre qu'on bâtit l'unité et c'est l'unité qui fait la force d'un pays. Sans respect des autres cultures et sans reconnaissance des deux langues officielles, il y a peu d'espoir pour un Canada. Pour un peu paraphraser Louis Hémon dans *Maria Chapdelaine*, nous sommes ici depuis 350 ans, nous avons l'intention d'y rester. Nous avons l'intention de continuer à combattre et espérons que le respect que nous demandons aujourd'hui ne tardera pas à nous être accordé et que nous pourrions tous ensemble grandir et faire grandir l'Ontario pour le plus grand bien des peuples qui y résident. Merci.

CHAMBRE ÉCONOMIQUE DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : J'appelle maintenant Rhéal Leroux de la Chambre économique de l'Ontario. C'est notre dernière présentation aujourd'hui. Our last presenter this afternoon.

M. Leroux : Comme je suis le dernier à présenter un mémoire aujourd'hui, et que vous avez déjà en face de vous le mémoire, je vais un peu résumer et distribuer le document de façon à vous libérer le plus tôt possible.

Fondée en mai 1990, la Chambre économique de l'Ontario est un organisme à but non lucratif dont l'objectif

principal est de promouvoir et valoriser les entreprises francophones de l'Ontario.

Il existe en Ontario non moins de 8000 petites et moyennes entreprises dirigées par des francophones. De ce nombre, 25% sont gérées par des femmes. La Chambre économique de l'Ontario croit que la situation économique de ces entreprises peut être améliorée et leur développement facilité. C'est pourquoi nous croyons important de prendre part aux audiences publiques sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

1710

Si le Canada a comme base deux groupes linguistiques, celui-ci accueille chaque année des gens de différentes ethnies. Ces nouveaux Canadiens apportent une dimension nouvelle à notre société et nous permettent ainsi d'élargir nos propres horizons. Le multiculturalisme constitue pour tous les Canadiens une grande richesse.

Les francophones et les anglophones du Canada doivent donc se réjouir de cette dimension nouvelle permise par le multiculturalisme. Si le Canada désire accroître son pouvoir économique, c'est par une ouverture de plus en plus grande sur le monde qu'il réussira.

Il est donc de l'intérêt de chaque Canadien de mettre en valeur les principes fondamentaux de notre société : liberté d'action et d'expression, démocratie et ouverture d'esprit.

Si l'Ontario veut maintenir et même élargir sa part dans le grand ensemble mondial et conserver un pouvoir d'attraction et de compétitivité déjà reconnu vis-à-vis d'autres pays, le protectionnisme doit être évité. À l'encontre du maintien de la position actuelle, il est préférable d'investir dans la recherche, le développement et la formation professionnelle. Le gouvernement de l'Ontario doit se préparer à accueillir les libres marchés et trouver les mécanismes qui pourraient être à son avantage.

L'Ontario doit continuer sa promotion sur la scène internationale. Poursuivant les efforts du gouvernement précédent, l'actuel gouvernement doit continuer la promotion de l'Ontario vers le marché américain, premier partenaire économique de l'Ontario, et accroître sa part du marché dans le cercle du Pacifique. De plus, l'Ontario doit repenser et réorienter sa position à l'égard de l'Europe.

Pour des raisons politiques, l'Ontario a fermé la maison de l'Ontario à Bruxelles en 1987. La maison de l'Ontario à Paris a à peine 17 employés alors que la maison du Québec en a 85. Cette situation est d'autant plus étrange que la maison de l'Ontario à Paris doit desservir le Benelux, l'Espagne et devait, jusqu'à l'ouverture récente d'une maison à Milan, desservir l'Italie.

Selon nous, après les États-Unis le milieu d'affaires francophone de l'Ontario doit, avec la collaboration de la province, développer son marché vers l'Europe. Le gouvernement provincial doit se doter d'outils et de politiques pour augmenter et améliorer ses marchés. La création d'un ministère international ou d'un secrétariat aux affaires internationales pourrait faciliter les échanges vers un marché mondial et favoriser l'économie ontarienne. Il est important d'avoir une direction francophone au sein du ministère responsable des affaires internationales. Le ministère de l'Industrie, du Commerce et de la Technologie doit déve-

lopper un plan de missions économiques vers la France et encourager les entreprises francophones à y participer.

En matière de coopération avec les pays en voie de développement, il faut encourager des programmes d'échange au niveau des PME francophones, petites et moyennes entreprises, et en particulier des coopératives agricoles qui semblent être le véhicule le plus adéquat dans les zones rurales de ces pays. Un effort supplémentaire de la part de la province de l'Ontario, en collaboration avec le milieu des affaires francophones, doit être dirigé vers les pays francophones en voie de développement tels que le Bénin, le Sénégal et la Nouvelle-Guinée.

L'entente Ontario-Rhône-Alpes et la participation de l'Ontario au groupe des quatre moteurs économiques d'Europe dont l'Italie (Lombardie), l'Espagne (Catalogne), la France (Rhône-Alpes) et l'Allemagne (Baden-Württemberg) doivent être poursuivies et accentuées. Dans cette entente, les gens d'affaires francophones doivent être invités à participer au développement économique et tout l'Ontario doit être impliqué, ce qui n'est actuellement pas le cas. L'entente Ontario-Rhône-Alpes se limite beaucoup trop à la région de Toronto.

En même temps que s'élargissent les frontières économiques, la Chambre économique de l'Ontario croit que le fédéral et le provincial participent activement à une décentralisation importante des pouvoirs politiques et économiques au niveau des régions et des villes. De plus, les gouvernements, autant provinciaux que fédéral, auraient sûrement avantage à privilégier le libre-échange entre les provinces, surtout dans les domaines du transport, de la construction et de la bière.

Il existe actuellement un trop grand dédoublement entre le gouvernement fédéral et provincial dans des programmes dirigés par les ministères à vocation économique et de formation professionnelle.

Au plan national, il faut remettre à la province la responsabilité du développement économique. Le fédéral doit se limiter à la promotion du commerce extérieur. Au plan provincial en Ontario, le ministère de l'Industrie, du Commerce et de la Technologie doit réduire ses programmes et abandonner ceux qui sont quasi inutilisés.

Dans le domaine de l'entrepreneurship, des fonds de départ devraient motiver la petite et la moyenne entreprise, mais l'aide à des multinationales en difficulté et l'octroi de subventions cachées aux entreprises internationales pour les encourager à s'établir en Ontario doivent être abolis.

La direction de la formation professionnelle sur le plan provincial et fédéral tel que connu doit être repensée et révisée. Le fédéral doit se retirer de cet échange d'activités. La formation professionnelle planifiée par le gouvernement provincial doit renforcer l'approche du développement sur le régional et ceci par l'entremise des collèges communautaires. À cet égard, l'Ontario francophone a besoin d'un collège de langue française dans le Nord et dans le Sud.

Un correctif fiscal énergique sous la forme d'une réduction des dépenses est important. Ne pas essayer de restreindre le déficit fédéral et provincial est simplement suicidaire. La Chambre économique de l'Ontario croit à un gel des dépenses fédérales et provinciales pour un minimum

de trois ans afin de pouvoir contrôler le déficit. Il n'y a au Canada et en Ontario aucune place pour de nouvelles taxes. Il faut se montrer très ferme pour maintenir les restrictions et les dépenses publiques.

Le Canada a la chance d'avoir deux langues, d'avoir comme langues officielles le français et l'anglais, qui sont les deux langues les plus parlées dans le marché du Commonwealth et des pays francophones. Ces deux langues sont utilisées sur les cinq continents. Leur connaissance devrait être encouragée pour permettre l'ouverture sur les marchés mondiaux.

À l'exemple du Nouveau-Brunswick, l'Ontario aurait avantage à reconnaître le français comme langue officielle en Ontario. Le gouvernement doit promouvoir la tolérance au sein de ses communautés. Dans les régions à faible population francophone, le ministère de l'Éducation doit encourager la création de centres scolaires-communautaires ou de centres multiservices pour permettre le développement de la communauté francophone.

Le Québec est un partenaire économique majeur pour l'Ontario et pour le reste du Canada. C'est un marché naturel et un voisin privilégié. Le Québec doit être encouragé à demeurer dans le Canada.

L'Ontario doit reprendre son leadership sur la scène nationale. À l'image de John Robarts, Bill Davis et David Peterson, le premier ministre Bob Rae doit être un leader national et un allié du Québec sur la question d'une société distincte.

L'Ontario doit proposer un Canada composé de quatre grandes régions, soit le Québec, l'Ontario, l'Ouest et les Maritimes. Dans le contexte actuel, le sénat doit être aboli.

En raison du contexte international des marchés et de l'économie, il faudra donc de plus en plus soutenir adéquatement les régions dans la conquête de ces marchés tout en recherchant l'équité sociale. Il devient donc essentiel pour le Canada et l'Ontario d'apporter des correctifs à leur approche de développement régional.

Cette approche doit : privilégier la formation sur une véritable base de décentralisation politique et économique ; faciliter l'accès aux marchés internationaux ; promouvoir une plus grande productivité et une meilleure qualité ; renforcer l'approche de coopération et de partenariat en valorisant les différences spécifiques de chacun et sortir des oppositions traditionnelles ; et promouvoir le bilinguisme, la tolérance et la richesse multiculturelle de l'Ontario.

M. le Président : Il y a des questions. Monsieur Beer ?

M. Beer : Merci, Monsieur le Président et merci, Monsieur Leroux pour votre présentation. Je pense qu'une des choses intéressantes depuis dix ans est l'essor des entreprises francophones de notre province et voir qu'aujourd'hui on a une Chambre économique de l'Ontario. C'est peut-être quelque chose qui aurait été impensable il y a dix ans. Pouvez-vous nous dire exactement comment vous travaillez pour promouvoir et valoriser les entreprises francophones ? Est-ce que vous avez des liens, par exemple, avec des chambres de commerce ? Est-ce que vous êtes complè-

tement indépendant ? C'est un organisme très nouveau. Comment est-ce que vous travaillez ?

M. Leroux : À date il est évident que c'est un organisme très nouveau. On est en communication avec les autres organismes à vocation économique dans la province de l'Ontario, comme le regroupement des gens d'affaires, la Chambre de commerce de Hawkesbury et le Mouvement des femmes en affaires à Welland. Sur la scène de l'Ontario on est en train de se regrouper et d'ici peu on en sera à une première campagne pour tous les membres possibles dans le domaine économique. Sur la promotion, actuellement nous sommes en train de rencontrer des différents ministères et aussi de promouvoir l'activité économique chez les Franco-Ontariens, des études, des recherches. On a déjà commencé avec la région de Rhône-Alpes et on est en train d'organiser une mission dans le domaine agro-alimentaire avec la région de Prescott-Russell, le Collège d'Alfred. On est en train de préparer une mission économique avec le ministère de l'Industrie, du Commerce et de la Technologie et aussi on vient de se rendre à Rhône-Alpes pour augmenter la connaissance de la France face à la francophonie en Ontario.

Également, on vient avec la PMPMI à Paris de signer un protocole dans le sens d'échange de services.

M. Beer : Merci beaucoup et bonne chance.

1720

M. Bisson : Monsieur Leroux, je vous remercie pour votre présentation. Il y a des idées là-dedans qui sont très bonnes. On pourra en discuter un peu plus en détail tout à l'heure. Vous avez fait un point que j'ai trouvé intéressant. Vous avez dit, si j'ai bien compris, qu'une des choses que l'Ontario et le Canada ont besoin de faire, c'est de ne pas se mettre dans une position de ce qu'on appelle en anglais «protectionism». Moi je regarde dans l'histoire de l'économie japonaise. Une des grosses affaires qui ont rendu possible le succès économique du Japon est exactement l'inverse de ce dont vous parlez. J'aimerais voir si vous pouvez expliquer ça un peu.

M. Leroux : Il est évident qu'en 1945 ou 1950, la situation internationale n'était pas ce qu'elle est aujourd'hui et le Japon ne se protégeait pas que sur les marchés économiques, il se protégeait sur l'immigration également. Ce qui n'est pas le cas du Canada. Et on sait que l'immigration n'était pas permise au Japon, n'a pas été permise pour à peu près 30 ans.

La situation internationale des marchés a complètement changé aussi. Aujourd'hui on ne parle que de l'Europe 92, on parle d'un bloc économique du Canada, des États-Unis et du Mexique. Toute la situation internationale a changé. Vouloir se protéger est une réaction normale. On veut toujours se protéger.

Je vais vous donner un exemple. On a des jeunes de 13 ou 14 ans, on voudrait bien les cacher dans la maison contre la drogue, la cigarette, la boisson, mais ce n'est pas en les cachant à la maison qu'on va les éduquer et qu'on va les préparer à être adultes. Alors, notre économie c'est la même chose. On voudrait protéger notre économie avoir des lois, mais face à la scène internationale c'est dépassé.

Il est beaucoup mieux d'investir dans la recherche, dans la formation professionnelle et c'est triste : il y a des industries, oui, qui vont fermer, il y a des manufacturiers qui vont fermer à cause de cette liberté de marché. Mais recyclons nos travailleurs, recyclons nos marchés, soyons compétitifs. Faisons ce projet d'être compétitif.

M. Bisson : Le problème que j'ai avec ce que vous dites est que oui, il faut ouvrir la porte pour ne pas se mettre dans une situation où on ne veut pas regarder, il faut être capable de rendre les lois un peu plus flexibles, de la manière de laquelle on fait les affaires avec d'autres pays. Oui, je suis très d'accord, c'est une économie globale, mais c'est une question d'ouvrir la porte sans ôter les portes.

On regarde aux États-Unis une économie qui est très protectionniste puis c'est une des difficultés qu'on a avec le libre-échange. Je regarde les travailleurs dans l'Ontario et le reste du Canada qui ont perdu leur job, pour exactement cette attitude-là, en disant qu'on ne veut pas seulement ouvrir la porte, on veut ôter la porte puis ôter les portes puis on va ôter toutes les affaires qui sont nécessaires pour donner un peu de protection à nos travailleurs, nos usines. Ainsi, je ne suis pas trop d'accord sur ce point-là. C'est quelque chose que je voulais clarifier un peu.

M. Leroux : C'est une question économique à débattre. Ne pas avoir embarqué dans le marché de l'entente États-Unis-Canada, il n'y a rien qui dit que ces entreprises-là seraient encore aussi en existence. Ne pas être compétitif et manquer de productivité par des méthodes de protectionnisme ne solutionne pas notre problème à long terme. Il le solutionne à court terme et c'est populaire politiquement.

On va aller prendre un café tantôt.

The Chair : Last question, Mrs O'Neill.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : I really do appreciate your presentation because it is different. It is from a different perspective and I think that is very healthy. Your very first point or commendation on the last page seems to indicate a close relationship between the politics and the economy at the present

moment. Do you want to expand a little bit about how one can help the other or one affects the other, the interrelationship that you see?

M. Leroux : Quand je parle de décentralisation politique et économique, vous savez comment le gouvernement fédéral n'a pas su s'ajuster aux dépenses et au contexte économique canadien. Quand je parle d'une décentralisation, je pense que l'avenir est vers les régions, c'est-à-dire des régions fortes et on le voit en Europe ; Rhône-Alpes en est une, d'autres régions c'est le même phénomène. Il faut décentraliser les pouvoirs du fédéral dans le domaine économique vers l'Ontario, et en retour l'Ontario les décentralise vers des régions.

Comment peut-on planifier les besoins en formation professionnelle dans des bureaux de fonctionnaires à Ottawa pour les besoins en Colombie britannique ? Comment peut-on prévoir les besoins en formation professionnelle pour les pêcheurs de la Gaspésie à partir d'Ottawa ? Je pense que l'Ontario est sur la bonne piste en travaillant avec les collèges communautaires, les 22 ou 23 collèges communautaires qui sont un peu partout dans la province. C'est là que la base de la formation professionnelle se fait, non pas à partir des bureaux de fonctionnaires à Ottawa ; ni à Toronto, d'ailleurs, c'est la même chose. C'est pour ça qu'il est important d'avoir des institutions, des collèges communautaires. On a un collège de langue française à Ottawa ; il y en a un dans le Nord, alors c'est-à-dire que c'est au niveau des régions. Vous savez que les gens d'affaires, les citoyens surveillent beaucoup plus les gouvernements qui sont près d'eux. Il y a toujours une meilleure relation avec les élus des gouvernements municipaux qu'avec ceux de la province ou du fédéral, alors je pense que la décentralisation politique est nécessaire au départ pour permettre de décentraliser au niveau économique. C'est un peu ma réponse, Madame O'Neill.

M. le Président : On va s'arrêter là. We will end this afternoon's session at this point and recess until 7 o'clock this evening. Thank you very much.

The committee recessed at 1727.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1909.

The Chair: I would like to call the meeting to order. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation.

We are pleased, as a committee, to be here in Ottawa this evening. We have been here since this morning and heard from about 23 different organizations earlier today, this morning and this afternoon. This evening's session has been set up primarily to give individuals an opportunity to talk to us. We do still have a few organizations we would like to give an opportunity to, but given that this evening's session was primarily set up for individuals and that we gave organizations primarily the opportunity to talk earlier today, I would like to suggest, as we have done on other occasions, that the time lines be set up very clearly so that we can give as many people as possible an opportunity to talk. We would like to suggest that we proceed with the organizations, with a maximum of 10 minutes, and then with the individuals, a maximum of five minutes. Also, I will call on members of the committee to limit the requests for questions, and that will again allow us to hear as many people as we can.

We will probably sit at least until 9:30 and possibly later than that, and we will try, as I said, to accommodate as many people as we can in that time frame; keeping in mind that other discussions will follow after our interim report, and that we will be looking for ways to ensure that there is further consultation and further involvement of the public on these important issues dealing with our future as a province and as a country.

NORTHERN FOUNDATION

The Chair: I would like to call on Geoffrey Wasteneys from the Northern Foundation to come forward.

Mr Wasteneys: I guess you would like to know the identity of the Northern Foundation. It is a think-tank organization with approximately 1,000 members. It is located in this city. It has held two national conferences on matters of general Canadian interest. It is a Canada-wide organization financed entirely by its members. You might like to know that the president is Ann Hartmann. She is a lawyer, a widow, a mother of six children, and she is a very capable person, but she could not be here tonight.

I am the vice-president. I am Geoffrey Wasteneys. I am a business consultant. My background: I am a graduate of political science and economics. I appeared before the first joint parliamentary-Senate committee on the Constitution and delivered a brief which was printed in its proceedings. I also delivered a brief to the second constitutional group for the 1981-82 Constitution; one of my suggestions was that it should be unlawful for any provincial government to pass any laws restricting the use of either official language. That clause was introduced in the first draft of the Constitution but eliminated for some reason, no doubt the insignificance of somebody.

I have come to talk to you gentlemen and ladies about the nature of constitutions. I am interested in constitutions. I have been interested in them all my life. The British North America Act is on my desk and it has been there ever since I came to Ottawa 40 years ago.

Incidentally, you were addressed this morning by Mr Pickersgill. It is rather interesting to me to remember that one of the first times I came to Ottawa, shortly after I graduated from political science and economics, it was to meet Mr Pickersgill. I was sent to see him by the student advisory body, advising me that there was a job writing features for the Prime Minister, Mr St Laurent. My meeting with Mr Pickersgill was rather brief, because he asked me how I had voted in the last election. As I had voted Conservative, that was the end of that.

What I want to say to you is that a new Canadian Magna Carta is needed. The Magna Carta, as you know—as every schoolboy used to know when we taught British history in this country which, sadly, we do not—was signed by King John in 1215. A new Canadian Magna Carta is needed to restore rights and freedoms taken away from working Canadians by elitist politicians and civil servants. The Magna Carta which King John signed in 1215 and subsequently repudiated, as you probably know, in 1216—but he died shortly afterwards so it did not signify—was not so much to provide new rights as to restore those that had been taken away or fallen into disuse. During his regime and that of his Plantagenet predecessors many topics were covered in the charter, but great attention was given to the retention of all the old rights and to protection from the imposition of new forms of taxation which is very familiar to us here.

The British North America Act, which is Canada's Constitution, was drawn up entirely by Canadians. I am sure you know that. It clearly states that the Constitution should follow the model of the British Constitution so far as our circumstances will permit. One of these models was a system of common law in which laws are determined in great part by custom which has been generally recognized in the past. When the Constitution Act of 1981-82 was passed, it seriously disrupted this model by presenting a Charter of Rights and Freedoms which was intended to govern all legislation, save where a province invokes the "notwithstanding" clause, by a veto held by the Supreme Court of Canada because, of course, any legislation passed could be appealed to the court under the charter. With one stroke of the pen, the vaunted supremacy of Parliament was sadly lost.

What is more, when judges are given political power, it should not be surprising that they begin to act as politicians do, and many of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court appear to have been made on political rather than legal grounds. It is to be hoped that any amendment to our present Constitution will seek to restore to the Parliament of Canada the responsibility it never failed to exercise in the past, the responsibility for our rights and freedoms.

Those persons who have been involved in the care of bees will tell you that the presence of an additional queen or queens in a hive is shortly followed by a swarm in which the new queen is followed by a large number of worker bees. Our federal system presents us with a rivalry from 10 provincial legislatures, and unless the absolute supremacy of the Parliament of Canada is established, it is virtually certain that there will be from time to time decentralizing forces. When provincial politicians speak of the rights of their province they are really only speaking about their own powers and privileges as provincial politicians. All of our problems arise from the rivalry of politicians seeking their own best interests.

A Constitution is intended to limit and direct the scope of government, and for this reason it is utterly absurd to place the politicians themselves in the position of designing a system under which they are to be controlled. The constitutional change produced by a Prime Minister and 10 premiers is likely to represent simply a resolution of their own interests with the interests of the whole country quite forgotten.

The best Constitution is the simplest. The British North America Act served Canada well. We have had nothing but difficulty and disaster since the amendment in 1981-82, and we certainly have no need for additional constitutional change.

It should not be forgotten that a democracy is a government in which the interests of the majority receive the most concern—the gentlemen on my left have “Democratic Party” in their title, so I think it particularly interesting for them to think about this. This does not imply that minority rights are restricted or rejected, but an excessive concern for minorities and the institutionalization of minority rights, including minority language rights, has proven to be reverse discrimination, and the real interest of the whole country has been lost.

920

It is presumed that the select committee on Ontario in Confederation has been hoping to secure a representative opinion from those organizations that appear before it. This hope has been sadly dashed by the bias displayed by the committee in the selection of organizations that have been invited to appear before it in Ottawa to present formal briefs. From a total of 24 organizations, no fewer than 13 were special-interest groups for the interests of Franco-Ontarians and, moreover, principally funded by the Secretary of State department and the province of Ontario, with few genuine dues-paying members. You might ask them how many they have. A further three groups were concerned with multiculturalism or visible-minority rights, and only four, as can be determined, with the general interest of ordinary Ontarians. If this is an example of the exercise of judgement of these legislators, what can we expect from their judgement on other matters?

I was shocked when I came here and saw, particularly as our organization was one of the first to ask for an opportunity to speak and was not given one. I am here now this evening and I will do my best not to preclude the time for those people, equally important, who are coming here personally as individuals. But I want to say to you gentlemen

and you ladies that 22% of the Ottawa residents are French-speaking, no doubt; 78% are English-speaking. This is roughly equivalent to the representation in the whole country, and we in the majority, I tell you, are getting damned tired of being treated as if we were the minority and not the majority. What has been done today by this committee is to destroy the franchise of the organizations in this setting that happen to represent Canadians at large.

I am a resident of Ontario and I have been one since 1918, but I owe no loyalty greater to the country. I do not give a damn for provincial administration. I do not give a damn for Quebec, Newfoundland, British Columbia. I am a Canadian, and I think we should all be Canadians, and the Constitution we are concerned with is one which will keep us all Canadians. Anyone who does not agree with that, anyone who wants something different, is a traitor to our country—and the term “traitor” should be heard.

In the past it was well known. Our forefathers died for the rights we enjoy today, and some of us fought for these rights in 1939-45. Are we to sit here today and see these rights taken away in the interest of the very people who are not prepared to fight for those rights?

Go to Vimy Ridge and see the names of the people who fought in two wars, in large part to preserve the freedom of France. You will find Ukrainian names, Norwegian, English, Irish and Scots. You will find some French, but far fewer than their proportion. It is not the fault of those people. It is the fault of their leaders, their false leaders who told them it was possible to live in a country and not fight for it until it was too late.

The Chair: Sir, if you could sum up, please.

Mr Wasteneys: It was for that reason.

I am saying to you that the government of Ontario and the legislators of Ontario have no role in the amendment of our Constitution, nor for that matter have the legislators in the Parliament of Canada, in the Senate or the House of Commons. It should be decided by a group of disinterested Canadians drawn from the public at large and not interested in their own particular interests.

If in this country we had a free press which printed everything that was said instead of just what they felt like printing, if we had a free Parliament in which members voted as they wished according to their own wisdom and their own judgement and not as their party told them to do, we would not have the trouble we have come into today.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

Mr Wasteneys: Does anybody wish to ask me any questions?

The Chair: Well, we are beyond the time but if there are any questions, I will allow them. Are there any questions? I do not see any. Thank you very much.

Let me just say before you leave, sir, that listening to your earlier comment about your organization not being allowed on to the list earlier, I went back and checked the list that we had, because I want you to be clear and I want everyone in the room to be clear that when the committee looked at the list in terms of deciding which organizations we were going to hear, and we have accommodated the

vast majority of those organizations, for some reason or other your organization's name was not on that list.

Mr Wasteneys: Our name was phoned in at the very beginning, and, Mr Chairman, I will tell you what I was told when I came today. I said, "We were one of the earliest to ask and we did not get even a response," and I was told: "We didn't choose the people for that reason. We wanted a representative group. We wanted to balance it." Now what kind of a balance is this?

The Chair: Sir, you have made your point. I would just like to make mine, which is what I said. We looked at the list of organizations and from that list there were only one or two groups that we did not choose to hear, and it was not because we agreed or disagreed with their point of view but because the issues that they deal with we thought were too remote to the kind of mandate that we had. Your organization, for whatever reason, was not on the list. If it had been on the list, you would have been heard earlier today. In any event, you have had your opportunity to speak, and we have heard you, sir. Okay?

Mr Wasteneys: If it was not on the list, it was not because we did not telephone.

The Chair: I appreciate that.

Mr Wasteneys: Thank you.

The Chair: We will take a look at that and see what the problem was. Thank you.

I am going to proceed now by beginning to call some of the individuals. We will have some other organizations later on. What I would like to do is to just indicate in groups of two or three the people I will be calling, so if people want to come forward and use some of the chairs that are here, that will facilitate our getting through, again, as many people as we can. This is a beautiful room, but we apologize for the distance because it sort of seems to set us down at this end and the rest of the people at the other end of the room.

ARTHUR MILNER

The Chair: Could I call Arthur Milner to come forward. I will be calling after Mr Milner, Harry Bateman and then Earl McKeen, so if those two people want to come forward as well. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Milner: Thank you. I think you have the text of most of what I am going to say, or in fact more than what I am going to say, in front of you, but I will go through parts of it out loud.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak. I believe that the work you are doing is crucial. There are those who say that constitutional talk is a smokescreen or at best irrelevant to the real needs of Canadians, the real needs being generally described as food on the table and a decent job. I could not agree with this sentiment less. The continuous bickering between and among various levels of government makes impossible any concerted and co-ordinated approach to dealing with Canada's economic problems. We will remain unable to face squarely economic or other serious problems until constitutional issues are resolved.

There has existed since Confederation disagreement on the relative strength of the central government and the provinces. The current division of powers has clearly failed Quebec and has also been unsatisfactory to the other provinces.

With respect to Quebec, we should accept that there exist now limited possibilities: extensive special powers for Quebec and a strong central government for the rest of the country; a sovereign Quebec and a strong central government for the new Canada; giving to each province those powers that Quebec demands, and a weakened central government. This is a wide range of possibilities, but one option is excluded: a strong central government with no special status for Quebec. Those who believe that significant support for the federalist option exists in Quebec are deluding themselves.

1930

Quebec will have to negotiate with Canada either in new powers or the terms of its sovereignty. Quebec is refusing to participate in constitutional talks with nine provinces and the federal government. After the experience of Meech Lake, such a position on the part of Quebec is justified. The rest of Canada must decide how it wants to be represented in talks with Quebec, but we should agree to come up with one negotiating team. Ontario can take the lead in suggesting how such a team be constituted.

The real difficulty, however, will be in reaching an agreement among the nine provinces about what kind of restructuring is acceptable. Will the rest of Canada opt for a strong central government or strong provinces? It would be easy if there were general agreement on this subject outside of Quebec, but there is not. It would be easier if we had started to discuss these questions seriously 20 years ago, but we did not. We will have to do so now.

I want to present two outrageous possibilities, two different directions, two different ways of imagining the country.

If the Canadian dilemma is between a strong central government on one hand and strong provinces on the other, the simplest solution is to abolish one or other level of government. Imagine a country from sea to sea to sea except for Quebec, with only a central government. Personally, I do not believe such a structure would be acceptable to any province other than Ontario, but it does suggest a direction. We could begin to explore this direction by agreeing now that anyone, especially a provincial politician, who calls for a strong central government must at the same time declare which area of provincial or shared jurisdiction he or she is willing to give up. Education perhaps? Health? Social security? Employment policy and job training? Which ones? How strong a central government are we talking about?

The second possibility is to do away with the central level of government—an outrageous idea again, but worth pursuing at least conceptually. We could have 10—or more or fewer—autonomous provinces or regions which would meet to negotiate agreements on areas of mutual interest—foreign policy, defence, equalization, even education and employment. A central bureaucracy would be required to implement policies agreed to by members. While an

member could drop out at any time, members would be bound by agreements reached. But policies would be adopted through negotiations by autonomous governments instead of the current situation where national policies are forced on unwilling provinces by a resented central government. Quebec might well be willing to participate in such an arrangement. It does, after all, resemble the Allaire report. It resembles, as well, the way in which the European Community operates.

I agree these are outrageous, complicated and far-reaching suggestions, but they force us to think at least about the direction in which we want to move.

I want to make a few more points.

The population of Ontario is approximately 75 times that of Prince Edward Island, 16 times that of Newfoundland and four times that of the Atlantic provinces combined. I suggest that Ontarians would be justified in feeling some resentment of the fact that in certain constitutional negotiations a resident of Prince Edward Island has 75 times more voice than a resident of Ontario. This is not what we normally think of as democratic. In any restructuring, we must begin to look at the country in terms of regions rather than provinces. Ontario might want to suggest, for example, the Atlantic region should have the same voice as Ontario.

If constitutional discussions are to work, they must take place in an atmosphere of respect and consideration—provinces for each other, federal and provincial governments for each other and, most important, political parties for each other. We must listen to what others are saying. If we use constitutional discussions as one more opportunity to score points against political opponents, we will have killed these discussions before they begin.

There exists in Canada, outside Quebec, what has been called a crisis of legitimation. No one trusts anybody. No one is seen as legitimately speaking for or making decisions on behalf of Canada. Commissions like this one are denounced before they are begun. The process of Meech Lake contributed as much to its failure as did the contents of the accord. There is every likelihood that any process suggested for constitutional change will be similarly denounced. I have attached a suggestion for thinking about a possible process. I will not read it now.

With respect to native claims, I have little to say except that the questions are both important and complicated. That native Canadians are divided into many organizations, different legal entities—Inuit, status and non-status Indians, Metis—and nations will make any resolution of problems more difficult. It is clear that we have barely begun to deal with native claims and that the native people are understandably impatient. At the very least, we must approach any negotiations with a spirit of generosity. By this, I mean that negotiations require a willingness to give things up. We should be willing to give up a great deal.

I want to end with one final warning. I had hoped that at this point in our history such a warning would be unnecessary, but a recent discussion convinced me otherwise. We all know of the passion that accompanies struggles for national autonomy. Eastern Europe, the Baltic states, Palestinians, Northern Ireland and native Canadians are only a

few examples. There is no reason to suspect Canada is immune from ongoing violence. Should Canada refuse to accept Quebec's decisions, we clearly have the ability to force the issue to the point where violence becomes inevitable.

The government of Ontario should at the earliest possible date make clear that it will accept Quebec independence in its existing borders if Quebec reaches such a decision either by a majority vote in a referendum or by government legislation following an election held on the question of independence. In the negotiations that will follow a decision for Quebec independence, Canada must negotiate fairly and in good faith with a view to Canada's self-interest and not in a manner designed to punish Quebecers for their actions. This commission has no doubt heard people say Quebec should be told that it has no right to secession. Such a position will guarantee violence and not Quebec but the rest of Canada will be responsible for this violence, whatever legalisms and petty excuses are used. For the sake of all Canadians, Ontario must dissociate itself from such inflammatory and confrontational positions as clearly and as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. We will carry on with the next speaker.

HARRY BATEMAN

The Chair: Harry Bateman. I will be calling Earl McKeen next.

Mr Bateman: Ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening. There are so many issues involved that everyone is trying to deal with that I am going to try and make mine brief. It is quite short, and it goes this way.

It seems to me and hundreds of others that Quebec is acting like a nail in Canada's shoe. The cure would be to get the nail out, and if it were possible, it would be a relief. The fact is, Quebec cannot secede from Canada without the consent of the majority. It is tied to Canada economically, geographically and politically. They are stuck in our craw and we cannot spit them out.

The many things to consider are the 75 members of Parliament, 22-plus senators, three Supreme Court judges, half a million English Canadians who were born in Quebec, and thousands of business people and all those who come to Ontario in the morning to work and return in the evening. What happens to them?

The ill will towards Quebec is due to the fanatical promotion of the French language throughout Canada by a few of the French Canadian corporate élite. It is not necessary for everybody to speak French. The cost of taxpayers' dollars is in millions. The problem can be solved by the abolishment of all language laws and their restrictive clauses. Bill C-72, Quebec bills 101 and 178 and Ontario Bill 8 must go.

In the past, interpreters were able to aid with communication. Language today is confused with education, which it is not. You can be illiterate in several languages and have no knowledge of what the devil is going on, but you can be able to speak them. A lot of people can. Language laws make the ability to speak French a condition of employment

and discriminate against 90% of Canadians who are not fluent in French, let alone joul, as well as thousands of Quebecers who cannot speak English.

If Quebecers can get rid of their spleen, the problem can be turned around in only a few months, but we need the co-operation of Prime Minister Mulroney, all the premiers, all politicians, religious groups, educators and all the media.

1940

Language laws are a crime against Canada and they are tearing Canada apart. We could live with a reasonable Quebec on a level playing field, but it has to stop whining like spoiled brats. Some 65,000 French persons were abandoned in 1763 by the French King and they swore allegiance to the British King, obtaining a freedom that they would never have received back in France. But that was over 200 years ago and here is Quebec still bleating about the fact that English is the majority. We cannot help it. They might just as well give up and say, "All right, let's get together." I do not know why they do not. It makes you mad when you think of it. Thank you very much.

EARL McKEEN

The Chair: Earl McKeen. I will be calling next Stuart Ross.

Mr McKeen: Because of the curtailment of time, I am not able to give the presentation that I had originally intended when I was promised 15 minutes, so I will only discuss two issues.

First of all, referendum: We must not allow fear of exposing divisions among Canadians to deter us from using referenda as a means of deciding important constitutional and social matters. The suppression of majority feelings and opinions should not be permitted in arriving at decisions affecting all Canadians for the sake of often disunited minorities. The people must be supreme. Politicians and professors of political science in Laval University or graduates thereof will not likely agree to the concept of referenda where people may make their wills known, but then that is to be expected of them and does not make it wrong.

Furthermore, polls, which politicians seem to favour, are limited in scope and accuracy and, worse, often directly influence people's opinions and decisions at the polling booth.

On the question of national unity, which is my second subject, this committee is going around Ontario trying hard to find things that unite us and finding very few. I say, in fact, name one. Language? Culture? Flag? Philosophy? Legal systems? Certainly none of those. Perhaps we are united in our distrust of politicians, but even that must be questioned. French Canadians in general seem to idolize their politicians, while on the other hand most English-speaking people worship neither flag nor politician.

So I say Canada will not work in the future with Quebec as a constituent or sovereign part. There can be no unity as long as one province has a legislated distinction that other provinces do not. The French minority in Canada will always feel repressed by the English-speaking majority, even though the reality is it presently enjoys privileges

not available to unilingual anglophones or, for that matter any other minority group, especially so right here in Ontario thanks to Bill 8; especially too in Quebec, where the English, Scots, Irish, etc, built and paid for their educational and medical institutions.

That, I might say, is a fact which is always conveniently forgotten or otherwise unstated by francophones. Remember, the anglophones or, if you like, the Scots, the Irish, the English and so forth, built those educational and medical institutions in Quebec. They did not have them paid for by the francophones, believe me. That is history.

I believe no minority group, ie, French, should have greater privileges than any other minority, and the only reason I believe English should prevail as the language of communication in Canada outside of Quebec is because it is the language common to not only the majority of Canadians but also the majority of people throughout the world. This, or course, is down-to-earth common sense, but then quibbling politicians are not known to be endowed with much of that.

Here in Ontario Bill 8 must be rescinded. There must be no language laws whatsoever. Thus, no language police, no costly translations, no unnecessary bilingual traffic signs. French people in Ontario will of course communicate with their government in English, just as English people in Quebec are frequently required in practice to communicate with their government in French, despite the fact that there are legal provisions giving them the right to communicate in English.

Further, there is no legal requirement in Quebec for municipal governments to provide communication in English unless 50% or more of the population is registered as anglophone. This means that more than 1,500 municipal governments in Quebec are actually forbidden to provide English-language services to their anglophone minorities.

The Franco-Ontarians are constantly stressing the need to preserve their language. I would represent that the survival of the French language in Ontario is entirely up to the voluntary interest and action of Franco-Ontarians and that the vast English-speaking majority should not be required to finance the preserving of French out of non French-speaking revenues.

The Chair: Sir, if you would sum up, please.

Mr McKeen: Yes, I will. What English-speaking Ontarians are entitled to question in any contemplated constitutional rearrangement is the loyalty of Ontario francophones to Ontario and Canada or the francophone majority in Quebec, whether ostensibly inside of Canada or out.

It is suggested that the conflict between francophones and the English-speaking majority in Canada will fade with the passing away of the current elderly generation. Think again. The sight on television of 50,000 francophone youths parading in Montreal on St-Jean-Baptiste Day last year waving their Quebec flags while desecrating ours on a large scale has not been lost on youths in English Canada. They are not going to forget that sight in a hurry. They too will remember.

Summing up, let Quebec go completely independent. Quebecers, according to countless polls, want to be inde

endent, although now that there has been some resistance from English Canada, that trend may be changing. Let us here in Ontario and the rest of Canada be magnanimous, not mean-spirited; let us not try to coerce them into remaining dissatisfied within an English-speaking Canada. I for one feel as confident about the future of Canada without Quebec as francophone Quebecers do about the continuing prosperity of their province without Canada. Surely if they have no fear, why should we?

As for the matter of the \$33-billion trade between Quebec and Ontario that Mr Harnick knits his brows about, that would be dealt with as between any two civilized nations entering into whatever trade agreements are mutually beneficial. But possibly the greatest benefit to accrue to both Canada and Quebec would be that without the perception of one dominating the other, our two peoples could become friends. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

950

STUART ROSS

The Chair: I call Stuart Ross, then following that I will be calling Lucien Saumur.

Mr Ross: Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, thank you very much for the privileges granted to all of us in making presentation to you.

Canada's history of attempted constitutional reform stretches back to the days immediately following the initial meetings in Charlottetown and Quebec. For almost 130 years we have attempted to find resolution and satisfaction in our constitutional arrangements. The recent federal-provincial negotiations known as Meech Lake are a final culmination of our inconclusive national preoccupation with the constitutional dilemma. These negotiations have taken place among politicians elected from regional constituencies, purportedly as representatives of the people of Canada, yet here is a strong feeling that these political representatives have failed the country.

We are now a country with a repatriated Constitution in which one of our major provinces, Quebec, will not join. Further, our native population has been denied access to the constitutional process. The Meech Lake fiasco has provided the latest constitutional crisis in our continued national partnership. Anglophones are disillusioned, as you hear here tonight, while francophones are angry at the rejection of their minimalist position. The national mood is one of pessimism. Our political leaders are viewed with disdain and our political processes with discredit. Finally, in the present impasse, the question must be put: Who among our elected representatives has a responsibility or a mandate to speak on constitutional reform when that reform goes to the very existence of our national identity?

The national consultations now under way indicate that the Canadian public is eager to redefine Canada. The people of Canada voice the need for political leadership and say that they wish to participate in the process of reform. The people of Canada propose positive solutions. A significant number suggest creation of a constituent assembly with the power to redefine the nature of the country. There

are even some who do support bilingualism, although I do not think you have heard from very many of them tonight.

There are proposals for a new delineation of the place for Quebec, for a resolution of the problems facing the native community and for a major change to governmental powers and processes. Canadians wish to preserve the linguistic duality of Canada. Certainly the young and, I would suggest, those who are open to change and open to the future are ready to accept that linguistic duality. They wish a more effective representation from less partisan politicians and they want leadership and a chance to play a significant role in the process of national renewal.

The question we face is what to do about this situation. The problem you face is how to resolve the myriad presentations that you hear and the diversity of those presentations. Canadians all wish to have a say in what happens to this country, but no mechanism exists for such a consultation to take place, other than possibly two alternatives, an election or a national referendum.

To legitimize and empower a national process of constitutional redefinition, it seems to me that a national referendum on the Canadian question is needed and is essential. The question of such a referendum should be to ask for authority to negotiate the contract between English- and French-speaking Canadians and to include in that process the natives of this country.

It should be asked to convene a national constituent assembly, to redraft the Constitution and, in particular, to elaborate how that Constitution will protect the language and preserve the culture of its English, French and aboriginal first nations. The constituent assembly should be elected by the native, French and English peoples of this country on the basis of proportional representation.

The task of that assembly should be threefold: to define the nature, the role and the purpose of the Canadian political entity; to prepare a constitutional framework for Canada by defining a new and a renewed arrangement of constitutional powers and structures, and finally, within the context of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, to draft a manifesto for the protection of our linguistic heritage and the preservation of our cultural traditions.

Proposals and recommendations of this assembly should then be put to a second referendum to obtain the support of the people of the regions of this country for these constitutional changes, and this should be done in order that direction should be provided to both federal and provincial governments for the implementation of those changes.

I find myself, in conclusion, in an interesting position, violently disagreeing with the remarks of some of the people that I have heard this evening yet in some ways sharing some similar solutions to them in terms of a referendum, a desire to protect and preserve language, tradition and culture, and it seems to me that the solutions that I put forward may move in some ways to achieving consensus, the task that you people have in trying to determine for this province. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Ross.

LUCIEN SAUMUR

The Chair: I call now Lucien Saumur, and I will be calling next May Nickson from the Council of Women of Ottawa and Area.

Mr Saumur: Good evening. Let me begin by stating my belief that the best Constitution ever written is that of the United States of America. This Constitution was written more than two centuries ago and has never been equalled. This Constitution has endured and served the American people well. Its superiority is evident when it is compared to any other Constitution in the world and it is no wonder that the Americans are so reluctant to trifle with it.

We, the Canadian people, cannot have the same scruple about our own Constitution. We are saddled with nothing more than a Mickey Mouse Constitution which is imploring to be mercifully discarded on the proverbial garbage heap of history. But why are we so reluctant to do so, except that we do not seem to know whether we are coming or going? We are confused because we do not seem to know what a Constitution is all about.

If we are to proceed resolutely at the task of framing a Constitution, we must first understand the purpose of constitutions in free societies. We must understand very clearly that such constitutions exist for one purpose and one purpose only. It is to limit the power of governments and to do nothing else.

It is not for the purpose of dividing the power between politicians, nor is it for the purpose of dividing the power between special-interest groups within society, as we appear to be doing presently in our country. Such power in the end is not power for the members of these groups but for the leaders of these groups, which is to say for politicians. Countries with constitutions that do nothing but give power to politicians cannot be but oppressive countries, authoritarian and totalitarian countries.

When all is said and done, the fundamental question that we must decide and that we cannot avoid as we discuss the Constitution that befits our country is whether or not ours will be a free country. What has made the American Constitution the best that has ever existed? It is that it was written decidedly to serve the purpose that constitutions ought to serve in free societies. No Constitution was ever written with such a clear purpose in mind, but the fact that it is the best Constitution ever written does not mean that it is perfect, as 200 years of use, misuse and abuses have certainly made evident.

Our country, Canada, is given at this time in history a golden opportunity to do what the Americans would never dare do. They would not dare undertake to rewrite their Constitution for fear of doing worse, but we in Canada do not have that problem. Unlike them, we have nothing to lose in attempting to rewrite our Constitution.

If we fail to do better than the Americans, we can do no worse, because we can make up for our failure by joining the American union so that we may enjoy the benefit of the best Constitution in the world. If we succeed and if we can produce a Constitution better than theirs, then it will be the Americans who will be begging to join Canada. Of course, we should not be concerned with the separation of Quebec from Canada. If we succeed, they will be begging to join

also. If we fail and must join the United States, then the fate of Quebec will be academic to the rest of Canada.

2000

Then how may we try to write such a Constitution? Let us agree immediately that a Constitution, if it is to limit the power of governments, cannot be written by those same people whom it must control. I propose that it ought to be written by a constitutional assembly, existing as a separate branch of government and elected for the purpose of creating and amending the Constitution, and for no other purpose.

There is much talk of abolishing the Senate for the reason that its function merely duplicates that of the House of Commons, and therefore that it is a costly redundancy. I suggest to you that perhaps the Senate ought to become the constitutional assembly. As such, it would have a function clearly distinct from the House of Commons and would acquire justification for its existence. I think that the constitutional assembly should have the exclusive task of establishing and fine-tuning the Constitution, except inasmuch as it is itself concerned by it, in which case the related items of the Constitution should be subject to popular ratification.

I propose that the simplicity and brevity of the original American Constitution serve as a model and an inspiration for the constitutional assembly. Like the American Constitution, the Canadian Constitution should delineate as concisely and elegantly as possible the extent and limits of the power of each branch of government, the division of jurisdiction between the federal and provincial governments, the procedure to amend the Constitution, and do no more. The constitutional assembly should not attempt to write a constitution which is different from the American. It should try to write one which is better and should remember that different is not necessarily better and better is not necessarily different.

I have a number of ideas about that which a Canadian Constitution should contain. I think that I know where and why the American Constitution has been wanting and I think that I can make reasonable recommendations about the means to correct these deficiencies. But I should not discuss these ideas at this time because it would be futile to do so until we agree that the direction that we must take is that which I am suggesting. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

COUNCIL OF WOMEN OF OTTAWA AND AREA

The Chair: I call now May Nickson and Shirley Browne.

Mrs Browne: Good evening. I am Shirley Browne, the president of the Council of Women of Ottawa and Area. I would like to begin with a small quotation:

"Our comprehension of one another's circumstances, needs and difficulties and methods of thought may be poor and weak at first, but it will surely grow and strengthen if we go forward grasping that magic wand of love, determined not to merely tolerate one another's opinions but to understand one another and to understand that value that underlies each one's work."

These words were very disturbing to the status quo in Ottawa in 1895. They were spoken by Lady Ishbel Aberdeen

the founder of our society. We are a society that has been evolving and growing with Canada for almost 100 years and we are proud to say our first meeting was in the heritage building of the new Ottawa Carleton Centre.

The Council of Women of Ottawa and Area is an umbrella group of local organizations which has been in existence, as I said, since 1894. At present its membership consists of over 50 autonomous organizations, as well as about the same number of individual members. It has always been concerned with issues involving the family, the community and the nation, particularly but not only as they affect women, because we feel that when women's problems have been solved it affects the whole family and thus the nation.

It is affiliated with the Provincial Council of Women of Ontario and the National Council of Women of Canada and the International Council of Women that has status at the United Nations. Altogether in Canada, I think we are speaking for approximately 750,000 to 1,000,000 women. Our mandate is always to proceed democratically and we are not allowed to make statements that do not agree with the policy of the whole council. However, this is a brief from the local council of women with the blessing of the national council president.

As I said, we have been working all century, but in 1980 we responded to the constitutional commission and we sent them this preamble which was a national philosophy:

"We, the citizens of Canada, affirm that our federation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a free society or free institutions. Proud of our country's stature among the nations of the world, we accept with the rights and privileges of status the responsibilities towards all humankind.

"Recognizing the vastness of our land and the diversity of its inhabitants, we realize that a federation is only possible through the triumph of our will for a common citizenship overarching yet respecting the differences of region, race, language and religion of our peoples. We honour those who left us richly endowed:

"The original inhabitants: Their care of the land from time immemorial acknowledging their right in perpetuity to some of the benefits of its lands and waters.

"The early explorers and settlers, the French-speaking with their abiding faith, tenacity in the face of overwhelming odds, proud possessors of their language and culture.

"The English-speaking, with their great courage and fortitude and traditions of parliamentary democracy.

"All the others who in becoming citizens have made Canada a mosaic of customs, languages and cultures, a country unique in the world.

"The identity of Canada is not fixed. It will evolve and be re-created by succeeding generations building on this heritage. We, for our part, with generosity of spirit intend to develop this inheritance, enhancing it for our descendants. We Canadians affirm our will to live and find our nature together in a federation based on equality and mutual respect, embracing enduring communities of distinctive origins and experiences, and are resolved that a renewal of the Canadian federation, guided by aims set forth in this

Constitution and living out the intent of the law, can best fulfil the hopes of our founders and of present generations."

As far as the brief is concerned, I must apologize for not having copies for you. Our original idea was to prepare a brief for the Spicer commission, but we felt it would be suitable for this one too; we are working from our draft paper, but we will send you copies when it is finished.

What follows is the distillation of group discussions at a meeting of the council of Ottawa on 18 February, which was only last Monday, where approximately 100 women met and discussed what sort of Canada they would like and what part Ontario would have to play in that. There was a workshop and the challenge put to the participants was: What kind of Canada do you want? Groups first identified what were for them the major issues facing Canada at this point in history. From their discussions emerged three predominant concerns: the need for national unity, the wish that Quebec be part of this, and the need for restructuring—remember, I am speaking for 100 women here—political institutions and the need to deal more fairly with aboriginals.

Based on these reports, we have tried to respond to the Ontario questions, and I am going to ask my colleague, May Nickson, who is a member of the local council, the provincial, the national and the international council, to speak to this.

Mrs Nickson: We tried to go over the questions very quickly and put what we had, to interpret them from our workshop.

First, on the values we share: In spite of all the opposition we have heard tonight, we believe there is a strong Canadian identity. We are united in our desire for peace, order and good government, concerned for collective rights and individual welfare. We like to think we are tolerant, able to compromise, value freedom of speech, social justice, caring and sharing with others. Many of us value the French language that makes us different, and we value being a middle power with a role as international peace-maker. Whenever we travel abroad, we are always very proud to be Canadian, and when we meet other Canadians, we have an instant friendship, and it is not at all muted by whether they have a different language or a different background. We are all Canadians abroad, and so we should think of that here.

Question 2: Canada must remain a strong, united country with the federal government as the principal player. We want to maintain a high standard of living. And to meet international competition, Canada will need a highly productive economy with a skilled labour force, and this necessitates economies of scale to cover the research and development costs which are characteristic of modern technology. If we are to remain a middle power, able to promote peace and international sharing to help the less developed nations, there must also be less confrontation and more co-operation.

The roles: The federal government must therefore maintain most of the powers given under the present Constitution, but with division by industrial components. The federal government should maintain security, control over external agreements, customs, immigration, currency, debt,

some of the communications, and environment. It must maintain the control of things overlapping provincial boundaries—the borders of the provinces should not act as barriers for any Canadian citizen—and it should control things which affect the growth and prosperity: most taxation, commerce, job training, environment, research and development, unemployment and trade.

However, there should be a definite shift in the power base towards the provincial, municipal and the native centres. They should administer their own social development programs. They are more tuned into local need and the programs can be more specifically directed.

2010

The aboriginal peoples: There was a unanimous feeling that we need to deal more fairly with our aboriginal peoples. There was agreement that they need more control over their own affairs, that land claims should be settled as soon as possible, that there should be an end to the destruction of environments on which they are economically dependent. It was believed that the effect of self-government on the aboriginal peoples would be to increase their self-respect and self-reliance, and the effect on Canada would be that we could hold up our heads at the UN. Many feel the role of the Indian Affairs department should be reviewed, as the department as presently constituted was thought to impose an unhealthy dependence among the aboriginal people.

Language: Some, but not all, the groups saw bilingualism as a crucial question. Many supported official bilingualism federally, while calling for tolerance and common sense in more local contexts. One participant spoke of having a dream of a bilingual country sea to sea, but of now recognizing that parts of Canada, particularly the west, find this impractical. Others thought that learning a second language should be encouraged but not imposed. Having a second language enriches one's life, "a delight," as one of the members expressed. It was noted that immersion classes were effective in teaching the second language. The need for recognition of the languages of the aboriginal people and immigrants was also mentioned.

Question 6 is Quebec. The Council of Women is willing to recognize that Quebec is a distinct society, one which, as a tiny linguistic society in a basically English North America, needs caring and nurturing, and we want to help preserve its culture.

Other regions: Other regions, too, have special needs and should be given the ability to control or to have a strong voice in areas of special concern to them. However, it will be important for Canada to have some basic national standards. These can be developed in many ways using a representative, elected Senate, some type of umbrella council, regional agreements or some delegations back to the federal government.

Now, Ontario: It is not what we want from Ontario; it is what we want from our Ontario government that we were talking about. We want them to stop making deals and start caring about Canada. We want honesty and competence in government, not politically biased information. We want an integration policy for immigrants which provides tolerance, understanding and fairness. We want work

for the collective good, not for the strongest lobbies. The financial and ecological implications of rights need to be taken into account, promotability and compromise, freedom of speech and social justice.

We were urged to think Canadian. As one member said, replying to the question, "What does it mean to be Canadian?": We have a passport worth stealing.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

ROBERT EDMONDS

The Chair: Could I call Robert Edmonds.

Mr Edmonds: Mr Chairman, in the few minutes at my disposal, I should like to offer some personal views on Canada's future in the domains of bilingualism and multiculturalism, the division of powers between the federal and provincial governments, and the need for national standards.

Having stated my purpose, I must say that I have been pre-empted to some extent by the very fine brief from the Council of Women. They have stated very comprehensively what I am going to say in more minutiae, detail.

I should perhaps explain, first, that I have recently retired from the Canadian Foreign Service, and thus have observed Canada throughout my working career largely from abroad. From this perspective, I can testify, despite all the hand-wringing within Canada about our national identity, that no one at the United Nations, where I myself have served, has any trouble distinguishing a Canadian from, for example, an Englishman, a Frenchman or an American.

Canada has always played a pivotal role at the United Nations, and this was verified by an American academic who, having spent the whole three months of one General Assembly session in the mid-1960s charting the traffic patterns on the floor at the House, came to the conclusion that the Canadian delegation was the most consulted of any in the General Assembly. This special Canadian role at the United Nations derives largely from our image as a bilingual and multicultural nation. We have a privileged entrée to the delegations from the francophone and anglophone African nations, and Canadians are generally regarded as people without any imperialist baggage and who are tolerant sensible and with a special talent for finding acceptable compromises.

This is all to demonstrate the point that Canadians should sometimes step back from all our domestic problems and look objectively at the blessings we possess. In particular, anglophones like myself should not complain about "having to learn French," but rather should glory in the fact that, apart from one small country in west Africa, Cameroon, and one island in the Indian Ocean, Mauritius, we are part of the only country in the world that has as its national heritage the right and privilege of using the two most important European languages on a daily basis.

Similar considerations also apply to the Canadian policy of multiculturalism. While multiculturalism has its downside in prolonging the hyphenation of Canadians, it also has its upside in that its encouragement of persons of all ethnic backgrounds to maintain their national traditions and folklore not only enriches the Canadian cultural mosaic but also is consistent with these other Canadian traditions of

tolerance and internationalism. Partly because Canadians tend to remain hyphenated, our country, at least in the years since 1939, has not been isolationist in its policies and has been one of the strongest supporters of the United Nations.

The other side of the bilingualism coin is that it must be promoted and fostered in all 10 provinces and two territories in Canada. The concept of Quebec's distinctiveness should not be manipulated into a policy of promoting Quebec as an exclusively French enclave. Such a policy of ghettoizing Quebec would not be in the interest of either Quebec or of Canada as a whole. Canadians of whatever ethnic origin should be able to feel comfortable living and working in any part of the country using the official Canadian language of their choice.

Any discussion of Canada's bilingual-multicultural nature inevitably leads to the question of the division of powers between the federal and provincial governments. In my view, the process of devolution of powers from the federal to the provincial governments has already gone far enough. Indeed, Canada's very viability as a country with certain unique values would be destroyed if the process proceeds much further. For example, and for the reasons already indicated, I do not agree that cultural policy should become exclusively within the domain of the provincial jurisdiction. Additionally, in foreign policy, Canada must speak with an independent, but also united and confident, voice. It makes no sense for the federal government to be allowed to retain responsibility for national defence but not for external affairs. The two are inextricably intertwined. Indeed, it has often been said that soldiers are put to work only when diplomats fail in theirs. Recent events in the Persian Gulf have amply demonstrated that point.

120

On the practical level, there may be some room for the rationalization of powers in the interest of avoiding over-lapping and of decentralizing the decision-making process in relation to programs which affect the welfare of individual Canadians. Additionally, some shared responsibilities, such as the administration of justice, might be looked at in terms of assigning them to one or the other level of government. For instance, is there any particular, overriding reason why the incarceration of prisoners is a provincial responsibility with respect to sentences of less than two years and a federal responsibility thereafter?

While in the interest of avoiding duplication and improving efficiency there is some merit in rationalizing responsibilities as between the federal and provincial governments, it still remains important to maintain national standards for welfare, health and other important people-related programs. Just as any Canadian should be able to live and work in any part of Canada and do so in the official language of his choice, so should he be able to move without jeopardizing his health care, pension and other entitlements.

The Chair: Sir, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Edmonds: Also, it is essential in the light of the great disparity among the provinces in terms of economic resources that the federal government be able to subsidize

cultural projects of all kinds throughout Canada. In this regard, there is no readily apparent reason why the Canadian government should create a new institute to study the cultural scene in Canada. What is required now is more financial support of those cultural institutions already existing which are already trying to preserve national unity and promote the richly varied traditions which constitute the unique cultural heritage of our Canada. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

CIVIC FORUM

The Chair: I call Chris Jalkotzy from Civic Forum.

Mr Jalkotzy: Thank you for hearing me today and hearing part of our group. One of the things I would like to agree with, particularly with the last two speakers, is that one of the things we must seek is a new vision for Canada. I think one of the things you politicians around the table will have a lot of difficulty with, in finding and exemplifying and putting forward, is the concept that you must catch the imagination of Ontarians in the ideas you put forward when you go and write your report.

You are going to have a lot of trouble with that, I think, primarily because of the background you come from. The structure that brings you to the seats you sit in at this point, I think, are a hindrance. Civic Forum itself, the party, the group, looks at municipal government, looks at municipal structures and says, "Where are we most easily going to be able to seek and find that consensus that Canadians see as an equal, shared concept resulting from the country we live in?" I think catching the imagination of the population at large is going to be your biggest problem. Politicians to date I do not think represent in many ways the individual opinions you see brought in front of you on the table. You can see that you are going to have to fight a lot of opinions that are sometimes quite alien or quite alienated.

I think you are going to have to look at starting fresh. What I mean by starting fresh is that maybe you should forget about the whole notion of trying to discover what Canada is. Maybe you should be looking at simply the process Canadians should use in discovering or developing their new Constitution.

Where should it start? A new structure will not evolve from the process you are using today, I do not think, or the discovery that the structure we have right now will be suitable from the process you are using to date. I do not know exactly how you are going to be able to put together the ideas you need to capture the imagination, where you are going to have a bit of a snowball or something rolling down a hill that says: "Now we have a sense, now we have an idea. This is what we would like to try to achieve. These are our common aspirations in education, health." We have a lot of them quite similar with those aspirations of people in Quebec, but the process we use to discuss those at this time in these quite formal surroundings—in these nice chambers that echo quite nicely, especially from the middle—I do not think is the kind of conducive environment you are looking for.

Maybe one of the areas the province should look to is the municipalities. I think some of the best examples are small communities. You will see community spirit in some

areas that is unrivalled anywhere. The ability for a small community to overcome adversity in all kinds of different ways, disasters, religious disagreements, are exemplified there. The meeting of minds happens at that level. That is where it starts. If you are going to find some place for a consensus on how we are going to determine how we want to get along, that is where you have to start to look.

Going around to the communities is helpful, but there is a formal structure that exists right now, today. Most of the municipalities in the province of Ontario are not party-bound, in some sort of allegiance. In general, they are fairly fluid organizations that represent and work on an individual basis. That is the forum you need to look to to help you develop the process to determine what our future Constitution is going to be like. I do not know if it is a constitutional assembly; it might be something else.

Native organizations and women's groups have a lot to offer in showing us different ways of seeking consensus. The institutions we have built and surrounded ourselves with in our Constitution, our party politics, our law, tend to foster confrontation. There is always a left, a right; there is no sense of seeking consensus. If you look at some of the political structures native groups use, some of the political or societal structures women have used, they are much different than those we have developed for ourselves today. That is the crux of it, from my perspective. Thank you.

The Chair: I will just say that we realize as a committee the kind of challenge I think you have outlined. I guess we will see whether we are able to meet at least part of that in some way. Thanks for your comments.

2030

MARIANNE McLEAN

The Chair: Marianne McLean?

Mrs McLean: I have asked to testify here tonight because of my profound concern for constitutional change and the direction that change has been taking in Canada in recent years, most particularly in the last 12 months.

I strongly support the policy of a bilingual and a multicultural Canada. The advantages which those policies have brought to us over the past 20 or more years have been immense and are ones I would not want to give up. I also believe, however, very strongly in a federal system, with strong powers for the federal and for the provincial governments. I see that system of government as being right for Canada, because that federal system has allowed us to build on what we have in common and to express that commonality to each other and to the world, as others here tonight have mentioned. I also support a federal system because that system allows regional identities and preferences to be maintained. What would Canada be without Newfoundland, without its western identity and, indeed, without Ontario?

None the less, there are many reasons to look at changing Canada's constitutional arrangements at this time. There is western alienation, there is the question of native communities, and most particularly, perhaps, there was the failure of the Meech Lake accord last year.

I find it very alarming, very upsetting, that from public accounts in the press, radio and television, it appears that the sovereigntist option is gaining wide support in Quebec. What can or should Ontario do in light, for instance, of the recommendations of the Allaire report? I personally feel that the sort of Canada that would evolve from the recommendations in that report is not one I would want to belong to. It is too decentralized a government.

I am not sure what the people of Quebec want now, so I would suggest that we ask them. Is there a way in which they would like to continue being Canadians with us? If their answer is yes, I think we should go the extra mile, try and find constitutional arrangements that would meet their needs so they can feel secure in the development of the distinct society.

But if the answer is no, that they feel themselves to be Québécois and only Québécois, they no longer have a sense of being Canadian, I think we must look to the development of a very different country. It should continue to be a country which is federal in nature so that regional distinctions can be preserved but that what we have in common can still be developed and brought out.

There may be some reallocation of power necessary between one level of government and the other. These are very weighty questions. I have appreciated several of the contributions I have heard already here tonight. I hope the government of Ontario will take a leading role in the discussion that will go on in the future. I feel that until now the federal position has not been well represented in Canada, that there has not been somebody standing up to say, "We have something in common. Let's try and build on that." I would ask the Ontario government to take on that task. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

PHILIP CAPOBIANCO

The Chair: Could I call Philip Capobianco.

Mr Capobianco: The word "diverse" accurately describes Canada's social fabric. Regional, linguistic and cultural diversity are fundamental characteristics which have been part of this country for over 200 years. Canadians, every province and territory must work to find unity in diversity. We must strive to achieve one goal, one dream, the preservation of this nation for our children.

To accomplish this goal, we as citizens must work hard to destroy the present environment of bigotry, ignorance and intolerance. These destructive forces have aggravated the present constitutional dilemma and are the cause of conflict among Canadians today. We must foster dialogue, we must promote understanding, we must not allow this nation to be torn apart by fringe groups, by dreamers who speak rhetoric. In the words of Pierre Trudeau, "Separatism is against the gut interest and the gut feeling of the average Canadian."

A large number of French Canadians in Quebec support separatism because they are dissatisfied with the present Constitution and the present federal system. This dissatisfaction is evident not only in Quebec but across the country. French Canadians, until the Second World War, traditionally supported a classical vision of federalism,

vision where both levels of government were autonomous within a framework of specific powers. After the Second World War, Quebec experienced massive industrialization and modernization. With the election of Jean Lesage in 1960, French Canadians in Quebec demanded internal change, and change came quickly. The Quiet Revolution in Quebec brought on provincial nationalization of the hydro-electric industry, the expansion of social services and the creation of a ministry of education.

In the 1960s Quebec sought change to the federal system, arguing that it needed powers and jurisdictions to assure the survival of French Canadians in North America. This was and still is a valid argument. With the lowest birth rate in Canada and with a population of seven million French-speaking people surrounded by 270 million English-speaking people, how can Quebec survive as a distinct society without certain constitutional guarantees?

This province, Ontario, must play a vital role in diffusing the present uneasiness in Quebec. Ontario must stand firm to preserve Confederation and fight for changes to our Constitution and our federal system of government. I am not calling for a massive decentralization, but changes that will allow the Canadian federal system to function better than it does today.

In November 1967, the late John Robarts, former Premier of Ontario, summoned the provincial premiers to Toronto for what was called the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference. The conference was called to defuse separatist sentiment and to bring Canadians closer together. It worked.

I call upon Premier Bob Rae to summon the Prime Minister, the federal cabinet, provincial premiers, territorial leaders, native leaders and leaders of multicultural organizations to participate once again in a second Confederation of Tomorrow Conference as soon as this committee, the Spicer commission and other provincial committees have reported their findings. This conference will allow political and cultural leaders the opportunity to discuss the various provincial and national committee reports on the future of this country and to give an opportunity to build consensus. Our political leaders will have a final say in any constitutional agreement, and it is fitting that Ontario play a role in bringing them together.

History has shown us that referenda and plebiscites divide rather than unite Canadians. The American democratic principles of majority rule and special status for no one will not work in Canada. Canadian constitutional and democratic principles have always been distinct and unique. Today in Canada minorities are heard, Canadians in every province share equality in social services, and poorer regions of this country are helped financially.

We must be proud of the nation we have built. We must fight for its survival. Canadians, regardless of ethnic origin, must open their minds and hearts, for the future of our nation is at stake. Let's work together to build a new Canada, a Canada of the 21st century, a Canada where tolerance, mutual respect and national pride are values supported by all citizens.

In conclusion, I would like to make sure that all people remember the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier: "Canada first, Canada last, Canada always." Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Capobianco.

2040

MICHAEL HAHN

The Chair: Could I call Mr Hahn.

Mr Hahn: My name is Michael Hahn. I am a chairman of 10 million ethno-Canadians, the Canadian Federation of Ethno-Business and Professionals. In this capacity, four years ago on 21 August 1987 I made a presentation to the parliamentary joint committee on the Meech Lake accord. In that presentation I made specific new Canadian Constitution-making principles, procedures and system. These specific principles, procedures, systems, all the documentation, are not only registered in Canadian Constitution-making history in Parliament, but also I made a complete documentation to the Prime Minister of Canada, Brian Mulroney's office.

Unfortunately, as you see from my newspaper article, last year, 1 November, Brian Mulroney's office appointed Mr Spicer as chairman of the so-called Canadian consultative organization. His principles and organizational procedures and structures are all my recommendations and principles. I understand that when Mr Spicer was asked to be chairman of that committee, at first he refused. I think it best to wonder why he refused. I understand he has no Constitution-making or academic background, and I am the one who invented new Canadian Constitution-making principles, procedures and structures, so how could he implement the new procedures? As you know, any governmental body or commission has specific goals, objectives, direction and vision. Therefore, whoever is appointed to that committee should have that kind of new vision, new ideas, and experience and academic background.

Anyway, that is not the point. I would like to make the presentation to you tonight. I have recommended many principles, but the most important is this: The Canadian Constitution belongs to all of us, ourselves, our children and our generations to come; therefore, the first ministers or any class of Canadian society should not have the final say in establishing the new Canadian Constitution. That constitutional direction, vision, should come from ordinary Canadians, you and me, all 26 million Canadians. That is the first principle.

Then we have to formulate the specific mechanism and the formula how we accommodate 26 million Canadians' aspirations, new visions, directions and hope. We have to specify that particular mechanism or formula. So far no Canadian constitutional professors or scholars or any politician identified the specific formula or mechanism, but I will explain to you a specific formula. You have a copy of my three sheets of paper so I will explain to you one by one.

Once we accommodate 26 million Canadians' aspirations, new directions and so on, then we have specifically, professionally, statistically documented what are Canadian ordinary people, grass roots, consensus or general agreement. All new principles should be incorporated in our Canadian constitution-making principles.

The second point we should ask is this, do we have our very own Canadian Constitution or not? Many professors, constitutional professors and some politicians may argue yes, we have had our own Constitution since 1867, Confederation, the so-called British North America Act, or since Mr Trudeau successfully repatriated on 27 April 1982 our Constitution. That is not true. Why? Very simple. As you know very well, in 1867 Canada was not an independent country. We are the colony of Britain. Therefore, the British Parliament enacted by themselves to protect their own interests and to govern the colonial country of Canada, so therefore they established the BNA act.

[Interruption]

The Chair: All right, sir. Mr Hahn, carry on.

Mr Hahn: Therefore, now, we should have our own Constitution. Then our Constitution is not only the abstract word or Bible or any provisions. The Canadian Constitution is our daily life and protects our interest and guarantees our future and the following generations to come.

Where is the Canadian Constitution—not only the Canadian Constitution, any Constitution—if it does not accommodate and guarantee individual Canadians employment, business, our happiness and our future. That is not a Constitution. Then we have no strong reason to protect and contribute to make our own Canadian Constitution.

Therefore, if we look at the history, Canada's so-called amending formula and the Constitution principle were studied in the full field, so-called, based on the legislative model. Therefore, we spent the last 30 years to come up with an all provincially acceptable amending formula. We spent many hundreds of millions of dollars in the last 30 years to come up with our own Constitution and agreement, but however, as you may know, through the Meech Lake accord and the Victoria formula or Fulton formula and so on, we all failed and it is all a waste of our hundreds of millions of dollars and 30 years of our history.

2050

Therefore, now, as I indicated in the first place, the Canadian Constitution-making principles and the directions of visions should come from ordinary Canadians, you and me.

Once we establish that principle, then as I mentioned to you we have to formulate how to accommodate this, and also we have to establish a specific formula to professionally, statistically document our general consensus and agreement to fulfil this principal objective as you see from my information sheets.

We establish a new amending Canadian Constitution contest for everyone. Anyone who is older than the age of 21 years is qualified to submit a complete draft of a Constitution. The first prize will be \$300,000, the second prize is \$200,000 and the third prize is \$100,000 and the fourth and the fifth prizes are \$10,000 to \$1,000, up to 1,000 people.

Why we have to open up this kind of high prizes and financial reward is very simple. We like to accommodate as broadly as possible all the Canadians, some kind of a consensus or agreement.

The Chair: It is time to sum up, please.

Mr Hahn: Yes, thank you.

However, this costs roughly \$2 million. How to finance this? We are going to mint Canadian pure silver 100% silver, one-ounce coins. This is a Canadian commemorative Constitution coin. I am sure of almost two million Canadians. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, for all ordinary Canadians to participate and buy the pure silver coins to hand over to the children and the following generation to come. This is only \$30. Therefore, once issued, we will guarantee that within 10 years the value of this one coin, pure silver coin, will be increased to \$100. Therefore, if we implement the silver coin, we are financially self-sufficient, and also we are going to make enough money to accommodate all the Canadian people's recommendations and aspirations.

Therefore, now—

The Chair: Mr Hahn, I am sorry.

Mr Hahn: This is my conclusion.

The Chair: You are going to have to conclude, sir.

Mr Hahn: Okay, you are a member of this committee and I already sent this to Premier Bob Rae, so please discuss it among your members. We are looking for a sponsor to implement this contest and the Canadian coin, so I Brian Mulroney refuses to implement this, I ask you people, as Ontario is the most important province of Canada to implement it. Then we can establish our own Canadian Constitution.

TOM SLOAN

The Chair: Could I call Tom Sloan? And I will call next Terry Olsen.

Mr Sloan: Mr Chairman, this submission is based on three premises: first, that Canada is undergoing its worst crisis since Confederation; second, that this country is worth every effort we can make to preserve it in some recognizable form in which the whole is truly more than the sum of its parts; third, that the province and the Legislature of Ontario have a key role to play, all the more so given the absence of credible federal leadership at the present time.

The other day, I heard a former federal cabinet minister say with the presumed authority of age and experience that the present situation not only is nothing new, but that we shall certainly be living through the same debate 20 or 30 years from now. That is precisely the attitude which I believe has landed us in our present mess. Twenty-nine years ago, I went to Quebec City as the correspondent of the Toronto Globe and Mail and I have been following event in this country with regard to questions of national unity ever since, and believe me, things have changed and they have not changed for the better.

Canada is in many ways a fortunate land and Canadians fortunate people. Perhaps we have been too fortunate. It is almost as though, having basically so little to complain about, we get bored and to make life more interesting decide to turn on each other. There is a sourness in this country that I find hard to fathom. In common with a good many other countries, we have more than one official language. Is that really a reason to whine and snarl at each

ther? Surely it is a reflection of almost 500 years of history and we should be proud of it.

There are a million French-speaking Canadians living outside Quebec who for too long have been barely tolerated, let alone encouraged by the rest of us. I would not like to think that the mean-spirited actions of the city fathers of Sault Ste Marie represent English-speaking Canada, but many French-speaking Canadians fear they do. Conversely there are almost a million English-speaking Canadians living in Quebec whose linguistic rights have been trampled on by the petty-minded provisions of Bill 178.

Should Canada finally fail, it will have been the victim of what I would describe as linguistic fundamentalists on both sides. If they are strong enough to prevail, perhaps we all deserve our fate.

This country is worth saving, for reasons that are much more than economic. This does not mean that we have to maintain the status quo. We have the opportunity now—it has been forced on us—to take a hard look at our constitutional arrangements, including the division of powers between the central and provincial governments, but that does not involve sending the central government to hell in a handbasket and it certainly does not involve the destruction or crippling of the national institutions that were created to help unite us. I am thinking of the railways and I am thinking of the CBC and I am thinking of the postal service, among others.

If the bottom line had been the final arbiter, Canada would not have existed. If today we choose profitability as our sole criterion, we do not deserve to exist.

That, I believe, is the kind of message that this province should be sending out. This is precisely the time when Ontario has the right and the responsibility to assert itself and show leadership. Our record over the years in matters affecting national unity, and particularly in the just treatment of the franco-Ontarian community, has been far from spotless, I admit, but in recent years it has improved dramatically and I give credit to all three political parties.

Now I would urge that we take one further step and declare this province officially bilingual.

[Interruption]

The Chair: All right.

Mr Sloan: I realize this might well have no effect on the debate going on in Quebec. So what? It would be a display of moral leadership. A spirit of justice and generosity has seldom, if ever, destroyed a society. Its opposite often has. That is just one example of what Ontario could do. My essential point is simply that we issue our own clear message. We must not allow Quebec to monopolize the debate.

100

Ontario must express its own faith in the future of a recognizable Canada. One thing we should try to do is to enlist the support of our Franco-Ontarian population in that cause, not as hostages in any sense of the word, but as willing and overwhelmingly bilingual defenders of a province and a country where they must be made more than ever to feel at home.

There have been times recently, too, when the Ontario government has been less than forthcoming in recognizing the special status of the francophone community. Now Ontario needs that community and that community needs Ontario and let's work together.

[Interruption]

Mr Sloan: Speaking of special status, Ontario must again make it clear—wait until you hear this one—that it recognizes Quebec as a distinct society that has every right to a constitutional status that recognizes its uniqueness in Canada and North America. This does not mean giving Quebec whatever the government of today or any day may demand. It does mean helping to lead Canadians in the direction of a productive dialogue between people of goodwill and reasonably open minds. I know there are quite a few who do not fit into that category but there are many who do.

[Interruption]

Mr Sloan: I hope not.

Let's reach them before it is too late. That, as I see it, is the role of Ontario in the present crisis.

The Chair: I appreciate that people want to express their opinions and their reaction to the speakers, but I would also ask people to show the same kind of respect to the people who are speaking that they had wanted themselves when they were speaking. We can all agree to disagree on certain things, but I think we all must agree to allow each other to be heard.

TERRY OLSEN

The Chair: Miss Olsen, go ahead. I should indicate just before you proceed that following your presentation I will call on Charlene Leblanc.

Miss Olsen: Committee members, as a fifth-generation Canadian, I was very angry when told, "You'll only have five minutes." I had prepared a longer presentation, perhaps not as articulate as some of the previous speakers, but in simple English, for my fellow Canadians, not just francophones. It is like going through a revolving door, swoosh, "Hi," "Goodbye," yet subsidized French groups by the Secretary of State get more time. Okay.

Canada at the crossroads: Why should there be a crossroads? Why was Canada's balance of culture/destiny disturbed? Was it to appease one province's demands/revenge or to perhaps mollify a few selfish politicians with tunnel vision? You blew it. The patriotic Canadians want it back, please.

I am fifth-generation English and French, but I am not very proud of my French troublemaker ancestors, and I am not a hyphenated Canadian, thank you very much. "God save our gracious Queen! Long live our noble Queen! God save the Queen!" I am a monarchist. I do not believe I am here defending my country's needs. The title of this book, the one you handed out, Canada at the Crossroads, should have read, "Where did we go wrong?" Why the hell should we be at a crossroads? As a patriotic Canadian citizen I charge all federal and provincial leaders going back 40 years, some posthumous, with high treason.

First and foremost, Canada has had constitutional mismanagement. It is unacceptable, a piece of garbage, not even worth recycling. A Charter of Rights does not pit minority against majority. Where is the justice? It is reverse discrimination. The 1982 one is social engineering. It disturbed the balance of Canada's culture/immigration without referendum—dictatorship—and it must be repealed.

Canadians do not want any opting out, vetoes, notwithstanding clauses, unanimity clauses in a Constitution. What touches all must be approved by all. A Constitution must abound with love, fairness and generosity for its subjects. The 1982 one does not belong to Canadians. It was conceived by politicians whose visions were of their area of the land.

Canadians are very angry and they damn well have a right to be. Why, why, why were all Canadians not approached? Trudeau said: "Canada is all grown up. Let's control our own country and future. Let's have a just society." Yes, "just," but "just" for Quebec? We have been in a mess ever since.

The Queen and her Canadian subjects were stabbed in the back. This Constitution is a top-down one modelled on Quebec's Civil Code and I will not apologize for this anger. The Canadian cry, "Freedoms gained," then lost in 1982 and 1987.

Supreme Court judges should not be appointed by the Prime Minister. Are they a patronage one? If so, no more. Three cheers for the Sault and other municipalities that had the guts to stand up for bad laws.

Social engineering since 1982, Canada's population very diversified, but the native is still first. Let's settle their claims, no more apologies to them or anyone. Must future generations be burdened for mistakes of the past? The battle of the Plains of Abraham, 1759 to 1763, fought, won, finished. Canada was made English, not French. Read your history. Are the French so insecure that in order to grow, all traces of English must be washed off Canada's surface? Were terrorists, agitators brought in to Quebec to stir up the people?

The new mollicoddled, hyphenated Canadian—multiculture. A name given to them by the vote seekers. If you are black, oriental or mixed, how does one ever deny that fact? Keeping them ghettoized, isolated, is a ploy to make them dependent, passive and for ever grateful to political hacks for their admittance to Canada. The First World War and the Second World War displaced people. They were so downtrodden, but after a very short time they found jobs and prospered. No mollicoddling for them.

How was Canada built and why was it so successful, beautiful and great? Through co-operation, love of freedom and free enterprise. Then another Quebecer, Mr M in 1984. His insincerity: "Elect Brian. Canada will be provided with jobs, jobs, jobs." Yes, jobs for Quebec, then close down some Via Rail, rural post offices, resulting in ghost towns. Another election, more promises. Good contracts, built in Quebec.

Bilingualism and language bills from 1969 have divided Canada. The venomous Quebec ones, Bills 22, 101 and 178. "Je me souviens," very racist, but that is okay, Quebec is distinct. I never thought I would live to see these

laws in my country, worse than KGB, Gestapo. People leave Europe only to face this crap. Give me a break.

Standing up for English rights: don't you dare. You are a racist and a bigot and of course a redneck. When the English do this, this is how we are labelled. I will not keep my mouth shut now. I will go to jail for what I believe in.

What is to happen to Canada? How can we save it? With honest, decent people with integrity. We cannot go backwards. We must create a climate of truth, love, harmony to build stability; a country where free enterprise is encouraged; a country for the people, of the people, by the people. We welcome all peoples, but we will no longer disturb the makeup of culture and blaming the already burdened descendant of the pioneer for the economic, racial intolerance. This was the fault of the overzealous politician.

One official language and no creation of false needs. The majority of immigrants to come from the British Isles, developed countries and then underdeveloped ones. French where required, the feds not to create these false needs. The federal government central to control economy and language. The feds would create a department of translation. Multilingual they would farm out to the other parts of Canada. From this pool, people would be sent out daily, weekly, monthly or, in some cases, a few years appointment, then rotational.

2110

The Chair: Miss Olsen, if you could sum up, please.

Miss Olsen: Okay, yes, fine.

Employment standards practices: Based on education level, but not race, gender, disability or language. Promotions based on merit, qualifications, not race, gender, disability or language.

Reshaping Canada: broken down into four areas or regions and whatever, western region, Ontario northern, bilingual, but some native-only regions.

So finally—I am going to leave that other part; it is about education.

I have got no separate school, one system of education across Canada—public. The kids can be taught religion at home and in church, not in schools. They can say a silent prayer in the morning. That is allowable. I went to a separate school and it was garbage.

Finally, the vultures from the dissenting province, plus franco-banks and subsidized French-only cheques from Secretary of State have feathered their nests long enough. Canada's money tree has stopped producing, the rest of Canada got the leftover scraps. No more. Goodbye. When these vultures hatch their eggs, many Canadians will be elated. After they have flown the coop, paid their share of the rent, we will occupy the nest with Canadian loonies. We will rename them nerd birds, because this is what Canada's leadership is now.

Immigration policy: Let's bring in family units. What about the existing family units here in Canada, born in Canada? They are struggling to survive.

That is it. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

CHARLENE LEBLANC
DEANNA MILNE

The Chair: Can I call next Charlene Leblanc. I gather that she is also presenting together with Deanna Milne. Charlene Leblanc and Deanna Milne.

Ms Milne: Hello, good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am Deanna and I am going to replace John Gibson, who was slated to speak tonight. I am a graduate from the school for the deaf and have seen a lot of difficulties out of the system, as well as difficulties faced by deaf members of the community who are American sign language users.

When in the school system, there is a tendency of teachers to teach only in English, often using the written word on the blackboard, and although they understand what the word is, very little is done to explain concepts. Certainly the teachers should be teaching English, but it could be done through the use of American sign language because that is the native language of deaf people and it is a language that we can understand conceptually.

I think there needs to be a respect for our culture. Just as we have heard respect for native people, francophones, anglophones, there should also be respect for deaf Canadians.

We look at issues such as employment equity, and right now we have seen that there is a lot of hiring of people who are physically handicapped, blind people, and so on, and yet deaf people are still often not hired. I think there is an inherent fear of how to communicate with deaf people and I think that we have to have more awareness of what deaf people are and a bit more knowledge about our culture so that we can in fact have opportunities for employment on an equal basis.

I know a lot of deaf people are frustrated in trying to get jobs that are advertised as being bilingual positions. We are bilingual, we do have ASL as well as English, but there is often an emphasis put on the French language and that is something that we cannot possibly access. There has to be some concession made, such as providing French courses in the schools for the deaf so that deaf people are allowed to become bilingual, which is right now an impossibility.

There is a lot of knowledge and publicity and public awareness on oralism and how to teach deaf children how to speak, but many parents do not realize more about deaf culture and deaf people, and I think that we should have more knowledge of that in the community so that people understand our needs and will then maybe send their deaf children to the schools for the deaf, which are a viable option.

Ms Leblanc: Hi, I am Charlene Leblanc and I want to talk just a little bit about sign language. I think some people may want to know some of this information. I think that we need to see an expansion in sign language interpreter services. If deaf people want to go to a doctor or any other appointment, they often are extremely frustrated because they cannot get an interpreter, or while they may be able to book an interpreter, they find out often at the last minute that the interpreter is unable to show up and this creates a great deal of frustration in the community. We need to see an expansion in services.

Ontario interpreter services and Secretary of State both offer interpreters. However the salary differences are

incredible. We should see salaries on par, because what is happening is people are working only for one agency as opposed to the other. I think we should see standards between American sign language interpreters and spoken language interpreters and they should be paid on par.

Another issue is closed captioning on TV programs. Naturally we need to see an expansion of these programs. Deaf people who are on vacation or are travelling are unable to access information that is sent over a PA system. There should be visual display terminals. There should be closed captioning machines so that they can access the TV in their hotel and so on. We should be able to have complete access to information, whether it is in PA systems or whether there are advertisements that instead of auditorially can be done visually, so that we too can take advantage as citizens. I think we have to see a lot more access provided to deaf people.

We should also see TDDs more available, the telecommunication devices for deaf people. For example, in airports if an emergency occurs, I have to try to write to somebody to get them to make a phone call for me. That should be a public service, something that is available to me as a citizen.

Trying to obtain information services, for example, I have gone to places such as various ministry offices for the Ontario government. There are pamphlets that are written in French, and I have quite a few of the various pamphlets here. They have been translated into various languages. We see them not only in French and English but Portuguese, Philippine, Chinese, and yet there is nothing that provides access to American sign language. The same with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Again, there are brochures in a variety of different languages, and yet there is nothing that is done in American sign language.

Why are videotapes not provided so that deaf people can also understand what these services are? Videotapes should be available. I know that it is expensive, but deaf people should be able to have access to that. If they are, for example, able to show that they are deaf, then they should be able to have access to any information. I think that is extremely important.

It is the same idea as we see in the Canadian National Institute for the Blind. People who are unable to access written print can get Braille printouts, for example, and that is a free service to blind people. I think there should be a similar sort of situation. They also have reductions, for example, for transportation. I think that other services should be developed. We cannot often access much of this written material, so there should be videotapes put out by the government that produce the same information in a visual form. I think that is critical for our education as Canadians.

What we are saying is we want equality, that language is not an issue; we just cannot hear. We are Canadians, and we should be able to access information in a visual form in American sign language. I have passed around some brochures for the committee members if they are interested in knowing a little bit more about what American sign language is.

Thank you all very much for listening to us. I do not know if anybody has questions or if there is time for that.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

2120

MONICA HYLTON

The Chair: Could I call next Monica Hylton. Following Mrs Hylton, I will be calling Gilles Guenette and Peter Annis of Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Ontario. Mrs Hylton.

Mrs Hylton: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, time is running short so I will not be able to get in all of the words that I would like to say. But first of all, I would like to speak about national unity. To have national unity in Canada or in any other country, it must have one language, one system of laws of parliamentary democracy and the Supreme Court judges should be trained or schooled in the same ideas of justice, freedom and morality.

This brings me to Canada and bilingualism. First of all, I would like to say Canada is not born of two founding nations and is not a bilingual country. There are many Scots and the natives and others who were here before. The myth of bilingualism born by the machiavellian Trudeau has proven to be a disaster. This legislated, enforced, costly act has caused division, disharmony, fear, loss of jobs, illnesses, discrimination and hardship throughout the entire country. It must be abolished and it will be abolished.

Ask yourself the question: Is it logical that nine provinces must be bilingual French and English for the sake of one province that is unilingual French? It does not make sense. Ontario's French language law, Bill 8, was pushed through in 1986. It was implemented in November 1989. Millions and millions of dollars are spent for this Bill 8, and as a result Ontario will be paying out billions and billions of dollars for years to come for the translations of this and that and all the other things, and it has only begun.

We were told last winter that bilingualism in Ontario would not affect the municipalities, but this is not true. This news release which was released on 5 July 1988 at Queen's Park by a group of persons—the minister released his task force report on municipal services in French, and if you read it you will find that every municipality in the province of Ontario is affected by Bill 8. That bill has to be rescinded.

All of this is due to the delinquency of our politicians and our so-called leaders, the élitists. They are responsible for this evil mess. In the historical documents from 1759 to 1867, language was only mentioned twice. The first time it was mentioned was in the act of the union in 1840 when Upper and Lower Canada were united, and the official language that was declared was that of English. The second time, it was mentioned in the BNA in 1867.

There has been a lot of discrimination because of bilingualism and I have encountered that too. I have encountered that here in Ottawa on a number of occasions, but we do not have much time and there is one story I would like to tell you, and I would like all of the audience to hear and whoever else—that is the story about the francophone bank. This was one of the most outrageous situations that the federal government ever established, the francophone bank.

What is the francophone bank? The francophone bank was established by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and its staff members were paid to seek recruits, francophones, to be employed in the civil service. The staff members of Energy, Mines and Resources were paid \$10,000 per recruit. This was their expenses. A francophone bank person is a francophone who is hired as a government employee but for whom no position is available at the time of hiring. Such a person was to be paid a salary of \$25 until such time as a position was established for him or her.

The ministry was committed to hiring 30 such recruits a year, beginning in 1982 to 1988. While I was working at the Energy, Mines and Resources Canada library in 1982 I saw firsthand a young francophone woman who had been brought in from Montreal. It was very sad indeed to see this young person, who spoke barely a word of English. She was set up in an apartment by the federal government and paid a fairly good salary. A position was created in the library for her. There was already a reference librarian who spoke English and Hungarian and French and German. The chief librarian spoke French as well. There were 3 persons in this library. I was an acquisitions accountant, clerk. In the nine months I was there on a term, I had occasion to meet with somebody who needed to speak French. This position which was created—

The Chair: Mrs Hylton, if you could sum up please.

Mrs Hylton: —was an assistant reference librarian, they had to bring in a desk, they had to find things to put in place for this person who was a recruit from the francophone bank. I was only a term, only there for a short time, even though I passed the public service examinations; because I was not a francophone, was not bilingual, I could not be hired and kept on in the position I had, even though it had been fought quite hard for me by somebody in the department.

The Chair: We are going to have to end there. You have gone way beyond the time. Thank you.

Mrs Hylton: That is too bad. I had some other interesting things to tell you.

The Chair: I am sure you did. We are just trying to get through as many people as we can.

[Interruption]

The Chair: We are doing our best, sir.

ASSOCIATION DES JURISTES D'EXPRESSION FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO

M. Guenette : J'ai avec moi mon confrère maître Peter Annis. Nous sommes ici pour l'Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Ontario. Nous avons un mémoire dactylographié que nous allons vous faire livrer demain, Monsieur le Président, en copies suffisantes et je n'ai pas l'intention de lire ce mémoire.

Il suffit de dire que notre Association existe depuis une douzaine d'années. Nous sommes à peu près 500 juristes des avocats, des professeurs de droit, des jurilinguistes. Notre but a été depuis le début de promouvoir l'offre de services aux francophones dans le domaine juridique de l'Ontario. Évidemment, la façon la plus facile de résumer ce que nous désirons depuis le début et que nous désirons

Jours c'est l'équivalent de l'article 133, dont bénéficie la minorité anglophone du Québec que nous aimerions voir pour nous-mêmes.

30

Pour reprendre les mots d'un témoin qui a comparu ici peu plus tôt ce soir, nous désirerions simplement que la province de l'Ontario soit officiellement bilingue. Cela sonnerait beaucoup de choses. J'ai l'intention de passer parole dans quelques minutes à mon confrère maître Annis. Mais je ne peux m'empêcher de vous faire un commentaire en marge de plusieurs témoignages que j'ai entendus ce soir et qui me font faire une réflexion que j'ai faite souvent pendant le fameux débat constitutionnel sur l'accord du Lac Meech.

On a parlé ici ce soir souvent de distinctions constitutionnelles entre les provinces ; on entend souvent des politiciens ou des commentateurs dire que le Canada ne peut souffrir de divergences constitutionnelles d'une province à l'autre. Parfois ça me fait sursauter quand j'entends, parfois ça me fait sourire. On a entendu, évidemment, premier ministre de Terre-Neuve le dire souvent. Ce que j'en entends pas souvent est ceci : que, depuis le début de la Confédération, depuis 1867, il y a une province qui a toujours été, constitutionnellement, énormément distincte des autres et c'est la province de Québec comme par hasard, où on a eu cette divergence importante et qui est présente en partie l'article 133 mais ce n'est pas le seul ; il y a également l'article qui traite de l'éducation et des tribunaux où les deux constituantes de nos langues officielles bénéficient des privilèges absolus, complets dans Québec.

Alors on entend, depuis la discussion sur le Lac Meech, cette réflexion et on l'a entendue ici ce soir encore : «qu'une province ne peut pas être distincte des autres, constitutionnellement» et on se demande comment il fait que ces gens-là ignorent la distinction constitutionnelle qui existe depuis plus de 100 ans. Si on doit arriver à la conclusion que l'on l'ignore tout simplement parce que ça ne les affecte pas, eh bien, ça me rend triste en quelque sorte pour l'avenir du pays parce que je me dis qu'il semblerait que les gens ignorent les distinctions constitutionnelles qu'il leur convient d'ignorer et qu'ils sont énormément frustrés par celles qu'ils craignent.

Alors sur ce, je passe la parole à mon confrère maître Annis.

M. Annis : J'ai l'intention de vous adresser la parole en anglais parce que j'ai l'impression que ça facilitera les communications.

I am going to speak to you in English. Speaking at this time of the evening I am not going to be able to dwell at any length, but there are one or two points I would like to get across as an anglophone who has spent a great deal of time working with the association over a number of years.

When one is searching for a bottom line in terms of what we are trying to achieve in our constitutional search in this country, it would seem to me that we are trying to achieve a more civilized society. By a more civilized society, I personally feel it has to do with the respect that we as

Canadians show for each other. It is in that light that I have enjoyed working with the association, and it is in that light that I recommend that this committee review its own position constitutionally, regardless of the question. If we do strive to achieve a more civilized society, if we do strive to show more respect for each other, I believe you will see, as a foundation to that, respect for the official language minorities.

It is a part of Canada's history, and our history is very complicated. We cannot explain it in the short time available, but what that history does demonstrate is that the Canada we know has been held together, and the degree of civilization we have developed in Canada has been contributed to very much by the respect for official language minorities. When you look across Canada now, you will see that by and large the constitutional provisions are enforced in the provinces of Manitoba, Quebec and New Brunswick. Ontario is the only exception in those provinces where there exist sizeable official language minorities, but these constitutional guarantees are not in place.

It is the submission of the association that regardless of what happens to Canada, we should continue along the path we have started. We should continue to respect minorities, continue to respect the official language minorities of the founding peoples, and that will contribute to a stronger Canada. But if a Canada cannot be achieved, it will contribute to relations between a different Canada that will be better for everybody. That is the principle upon which I personally support official language expansion in our country, because I believe it will lead to a more civilized country and a country where we are better off morally and eventually financially, and in every way possible.

The Chair: Merci. Thank you very much.

MIKE RYGUS

Mr Rygus: Prior to my retirement in May 1984, I was the senior Canadian officer of an international union for 23 years; before that I was an international representative. During that spell of 31 years, I have criss-crossed this country umpteen dozen times in every province. I have dealt with thousands of Canadians. I have dealt with every Prime Minister and many cabinet ministers, federal and provincial. I have criss-crossed the US. I have lived in Quebec for nine months. I have worked in Quebec off and on, been there hundreds of times, so I have a little idea of what Canada and Canadians are about.

I want to deal primarily with a problem that is staring us in the face. The so-called constitutional crisis is not a crisis in the minds of average Canadians, including most Quebecers. It is an issue blown out of proportion by power-hungry politicians, the news media, the intellectuals who enjoy well-paid, secure jobs, and the elitist in our society.

Let me comment first on the Meech Lake fiasco. It failed because of bungling by the Prime Minister and some of the provincial premiers. However, let's not be deluded into thinking that if the Meech Lake accord had been approved it would have solved our constitutional problems in Quebec for very long. The separatists would have continued to agitate for independence under the guise of sovereignty-association or some other dubious illusion, and it is

quite likely that Parti québécois would have won the next Quebec election and we would then be where we are now, in a constitutional confrontation with Quebec.

2140

The entire constitutional debate is so wrapped up in political baffle and news media simplistic reporting that the average Canadian is unable to grasp what it is all about. The first thing we need to do is debunk this charade and inject some down-to-earth realism into the debate. The first principle of realism in negotiations is that you do not solve problems by appeasement. On the contrary, appeasement only compounds problems.

It is amazing to see so many intelligent Quebecers engage in sophisticated naïveté in this debate. The Allaire report, with its demands for 22 areas of jurisdiction, is so out of touch with reality that it lacks any credibility. It is nothing more than a brazen grab for political power, and stands no chance of being accepted in the rest of Canada.

Quebec certainly has a valid case in asking for constitutional changes or other arrangements to protect its French language and culture. I am convinced that the rest of Canada would agree to such changes. The report demands a massive transfer of federal jurisdiction but at the same time requests that Quebec continue to receive federal equalization payments. Also, it is ironic to see it criticize the federal government for failure to bring its deficits under control but ignore the fact that Quebec has been treated very generously by the federal Treasury. How can we treat Quebec's demands seriously in the face of such absurdities?

Those of you who had the opportunity to see the weekend paper, the Sunday Toronto Star or the Saturday Ottawa Citizen—if you have not, take a look at Eugene Forsey's critique of the Allaire report. It is worth framing and keeping.

Since the Meech rejection, various public opinion polls have shown that up to 70% of Quebecers favour independence; however, recent polls are beginning to show otherwise. Premier Bourassa is quoted last Saturday as saying the economy is more important to him than the Constitution, and I will bet this is the case with the great majority of Quebecers. It sounds like some of the romantic euphoria is fading and down-to-earth thinking is starting to emerge.

The Allaire report calls for a Quebec referendum in 1992. It appears the Bélanger-Campeau commission will propose that it be held in 1991. Even though Premier Bourassa insists there will be no referendum this year, public outcry may force his hand. I notice that within the last day, Lucien Bouchard, the Bloc québécois leader, says there are going to mass demonstrations in Quebec unless they get the referendum this year.

The Chair: Mr Rygus, if you could sum up, please.

Mr Rygus: Let's be frank with each other. If we had a perfect Constitution today, it would not solve our major economic and social problems; high unemployment, lack of affordable housing, rising welfare, medicare and education costs, regional disparities and many others will still be with us. The federal government as well as most provinces and municipalities face staggering deficits and increasing demands for more spending. Even a perfect Constitution

would not produce countless billions of dollars each year that are needed to cope with these problems.

We expect Bob Rae to play a strong, leading or statesmanlike role in these constitutional negotiations. There is no place for political expediency at this time. Voters are fed up with political squabbling and self-serving opportunism that have plagued constitutional discussions in the past.

Canada will be a more prosperous country if Quebec stays with us. Canada without Quebec will survive, a little less prosperous and less influential in the world community. An independent Quebec could survive too, but with a lower standard of living, higher interest rates, higher taxes and many problems in its financial relations with other countries. It certainly would not become the national paradise its separatist dreamers promise to create. That is my view.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

MARVIN JASON

The Chair: Marvin Jason, and I will call next Dr Jean Cottam.

Mr Jason: We represent ex-Quebeckers and there are about 450,000 of them who left since 1966. We believe that since we have lived in Quebec and all parts of Canada we understand the situation as well as most, if not better than most. Most of us left Quebec because of some persistent harassment and threats, but we will leave that.

Switzerland is the only successful mosaic in the world today and even it has a French separatist group. All large country mosaics have failed, some with even less differences than are found in Canada. It is only arrogance for us to think that we will succeed when so many have failed.

A little bit of mosaic theory: A review of mosaic suggests that one is feasible when none of the smaller parts is larger than a critical mass. A critical mass occurs when smaller part numbers 500,000 or 18% plus of the population and they are in close proximity to each other. Our article referred to studies that indicated the critical mass could be as low as 14%. Maoist theory puts it at 15%. It is feasible to keep a mosaic together, even though there is great desire for sovereignty. This can be done through actual or threatened force, either physical or economical.

A successful mosaic is a democracy held together by Constitution with little physical force or civil unrest and good quality of life, and the only successful mosaic in the world today is Switzerland. What I ask is, why do we want to reinvent the wheel? They have a number of aspects that minimize conflict in their country.

They have a number of official languages, but each canton has only one language. Everything is done in the one language. There are no signage restrictions, but it is restricted to the one language. They also change their President frequently. In other words, you do not get a Prime Minister who is spending most of his time worrying about being re-elected. So the other thing we suggest is that there should be a restriction on the time or a time limit for the Prime Minister.

We recommend, as the Swiss have, a single language by canton—in our case, it will be a province—and

requent changing of the Prime Minister, say, for a fixed period.

The Swiss have a right of referendum. Whenever you have 100,000 names that sign a petition, they must have a referendum on the law that they are contesting. They have a similar thing in California, and we suggest that this could be an important addition to our Constitution.

There are a few items, I have them in the report, that we suggest, one of them for aboriginals. I will not be able to respond to everything here, but the aboriginals, we think, should be handled by having an aboriginal party presented in proportion to their population and they could vote for their party for the government.

Each canton in Switzerland is represented in their parliament equivalent to our Senate and they have equal representation. The ratio of the smallest canton to the largest is quite significant and we suggest equal representation in our Senate is important. The ratio of the population between Wyoming and California is roughly the same as that between EI and Ontario. They have an equal representation in their Senate and we believe that it is important that we would have that as well.

The other aspect we believe that is important, that is a very strong weakness in our Constitution, is when we have representation by population. We believe that what happened in New Brunswick is very bad for democracy, that a party that gets a percentage of 5% of the plurality could have less than half of its plurality represented in the government. So if a party had, say, 8%, it would be assured of a 4% representation and would be appointed in some manner. We could do it the way they do it in Israel, but there are many different options.

Switzerland's mosaic has another advantage. They are together, shoulder to shoulder—by the way, this is what I gave to the Bélanger-Campeau commission, a good part of this part—when faced with perceived emergencies or threats. In Canada, too many Quebecers have not done so in two world wars and the Boer War. Even when Alberta oil was being developed, they did not bear their share of the burden as all provinces west of their border had to.

A critical mass minority with perceived injustices is a threat to a peaceful country. The threat, an actual occurrence of violence, is higher in Quebec than in any other province. Some countries can get so large that considered economies of scale become diseconomies; for example, transporting of butter and milk products from Quebec, 1,000 miles, to BC, when it could have been produced in BC at a lower total cost to Canada. Too many uneconomical situations have been forced on Canada just to satisfy Quebec. Quebec has controlled Canada for most of the last 40 years, and many Canadians are fed up with asymmetrical federalism. For 32 of the last 40 years, the Prime Minister came from Quebec.

If I go through all this in the paper, how they are essentially handling the federal civil service—there is no using up over it and going over purification, how Quebec trifurcates parts of its country. For example, Montreal at one time had a majority of anglophones. In 1867, 55% of Montreal was anglophone, 55% of the Eastern Townships was anglophone. There is only 9% of that now in the Eastern

Townships. Like Pinocchio, we notice Bourassa's and many pure-laine noses getting longer and longer. Canadians outside of Quebec are learning to spot the many fibs coming out of that province. A successful Confederation can only be based on truth and honesty.

2150

Since New France was founded, Quebec has been a religiously racist society. It is only when you get out from under the cloud, as we did, that you find out how much more racist, xenophobic, anti-Semitic and anti-visible-minority Quebec is than any other province is. These actions embarrass and disgust much of the rest of Canada. Censuring of actions in Quebec by the European Parliament, article 19, and a UN human rights committee, an investigation by Amnesty International are great embarrassments to many Canadians.

Quebec does not produce one mineral that is not found somewhere else in Canada. The pure-laine will never be satisfied until they have their own government and reach their perceived potential, something they will never achieve as part of Canada. The question of Quebec separation would have arisen whether Meech Lake was approved or not. Even if they do separate, they can always return. Accommodation is possible, but we will never succeed as a mosaic. Quebec is following the melting-pot theory and the rest of Canada is trying to follow a mosaic. How can you run a country with them doing a melting pot and us or the rest of Canada trying to run a mosaic? It just does not work.

Canada needs provinces that are willing to contribute for the good of all, not to stay for the loot or until it is not profitable for them any more.

The Chair: Sir, would you sum up, please?

Mr Jason: Over 300 years ago, Cromwell addressed Parliament. Amery repeated the address to Chamberlain and we repeated it to Quebec in this B and C submission: "You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go."

I will leave this report for you.

The Chair: Thank you.

K. JEAN COTTAM

The Chair: I am going to call Dr Jean Cottam and I am going to suggest that we hear one other person after that, Tony Sylvestro. Then I think we are going to have to conclude at that point.

Dr Cottam: I believe that there is an urgent need for a commonsense approach to the Quebec issue. Decentralization of the rest of Canada for the sake of satisfying Quebec ought to be ruled out. The provisions of Bill C-69 must be vigorously opposed and eventually reversed. I do not know how many people in this room know what Bill C-69 represents. It represents the removal of the federal government presence in our higher education and medicare.

A complete disappearance of federal government in medicare and post-secondary education is going to take place around 2004, and this is one of the major reasons why post-secondary education and medicare are in trouble.

We cannot afford to decentralize Canada. The same applies to the UIC. The federal government has removed itself from UIC. Equalization payments to the provinces should be maintained. The Ontario government should publicize these matters for the benefit of Canada at large.

It is better to aim at an amicable divorce than to stay in a highly destructive marriage. We cannot hold on to Quebec by force against its will. It would be no less immoral to do so than for the USSR to hold on to Lithuania. Even without Quebec, English Canada would still constitute the eighth-largest economy. Close economic ties with a politically independent Quebec are quite feasible and would be of benefit to both parties. In the event of Quebec separation, Ontario must reassure the other provinces that Ontario welcomes them to the new, even more viable, Canada.

We should tell Quebec that we prefer them to stay, but on terms that are mutually satisfactory. The underlying principle should be that Quebec has no right to destroy the rest of Canada. It has no right to prevent it from articulating its own vision urgently required. There should be no more concessions to Quebec that impact on the viability and prosperity of the rest of Canada. We must restructure our outdated and undemocratic political system in terms of a sensible variant of proportional representation and an elected Senate representative of all the constituent provinces, so that no Canadian government obtains a majority with less than 50% of the popular vote.

I would refer you to an excellent book which deals with this subject. It is called *Getting Ready for 1999: Ideas for Canada's Politics and Government*. It is by Tom Kent, a former public servant and it is published by the Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1989.

All of the above is necessary to come to grips with the crucial issue of what kind of Canada we ought to have: a Canada of extreme poverty and extreme wealth, ie, a banana republic of the north with a puppet government in Ottawa, or a Canada ready for the 21st century.

I believe that to the latter end the Ontario government should educate the Canadian public about the consequences of our bilateral free trade agreement with the United States and the likely consequences of the potential trilateral agreement. I believe that, regardless of the cost, we must get rid of the Canada-US free trade agreement because of its serious threat to Canadian prosperity and sovereignty. Being master in our own house is a sine qua non of not only satisfying our urgent need for an appropriate social safety net, social charter and protection of the environment, but also improving our competitiveness in the global economy.

Quite to the contrary, we hear our business people, particularly big business, telling us that in order to be competitive in a global economy, we must have this free trade agreement. It is the other way around. The free trade agreement is putting such fetters on us in terms of our monetary policy, in terms of our fiscal policy, that we cannot possibly compete in a global environment. It is countries like Germany and Japan that are masters in their own house that are doing best in the global economy. Thank you.

2200

The Chair: We probably can take one other person and I will just call Ken McRae following Mr Sylvestro.

Interjection: Mr Chairman, a question from the floor on behalf of the audience that will not be represented. Will we have a chance to make representations? Would you be coming back to Ottawa or would you suggest that we make our representations?

The Chair: I was going to say that at the end, sir, but since you raised it, we would invite those people that will not get an opportunity to speak to us tonight to feel free to send us their comments in writing. Please do not feel that they have to be elaborate or in a polished form. In whatever form they are, we will be glad to have them. We have not put together our plans for the second stage of our work, so we are not in a position to say whether we will be returning to Ottawa or not. We certainly will not be returning to putting together our interim report.

Interjection : Alors, vous êtes les bienvenus à Ottawa. We hope you will all soon come back.

M. le Président : Merci.

TONY SYLVESTRO

The Chair: Tony Sylvestro.

Mr Sylvestro: My speech is only five minutes, but because I have been told that is all I was allowed. You men and women will be glad to know that. Before I begin it would also like to let you know I have a petition signed by umpteen university teachers, professors, teachers in the Ottawa school board, as well as students in university and high school. So I am not only speaking for myself, I am speaking for them. These will be sent to all your offices once I get them photocopied.

Democracy: We are supposed to live in a democratic society, government by the people, directly or through representatives. After approximately 20 consecutive years of French prime ministers from Quebec who have continued to pass laws and bills declaring Canada bilingual, it is quite obvious we as a country are further now away from national unity than we ever have been in Canadian history.

Two languages, when forced upon the opposites, cannot and will not work. It is strange, when 90% of the population outside Quebec state English as their mother tongue and 6% French. Why have the majority of Canadians never been asked if they wanted their country declared bilingual by a French Prime Minister? We have continued to have enforced bilingualism entrenched in the federal government as well as the Constitution.

In Ontario, we pass bills such as Bill 8, basically declaring Ontario bilingual, while in Quebec they continue to reject the English language and bilingualism by passing anti-English bills such as Bill 178 and Bill 101. Over 10% of Quebec's population lists English as their mother tongue. In Ontario, less than 6% list French as their mother tongue. Why the double standard?

In Ontario alone, especially Ottawa, we have to offer just about every public service in both languages at a cost of approximately \$4 million daily, as quoted by David Peterson during the last provincial election. Do you hear?

at? Four million dollars daily, and that was almost a year ago. Why have we been forced to continue to spend millions of dollars daily on enforced bilingualism while the government of Canada cuts back in such areas as welfare programs, employment opportunity, social programs, the National Research Council, CBC radio and TV, and the list goes on?

I find it strange how the government can justify cutting back in all areas of spending while increasing spending on bilingualism. In Ottawa, the nation's artificial bilingual capital, we offer almost every public service in both languages, yet the French politicians continue to complain about a lack of French services, while just across the ridge in Hull, most services, ie, hospital, Outaouais transit services, public signs—I can go on—are offered in French only. Why the double standard again?

I could continue to go on about the double standard created by a discriminatory federal government, but that is not really why I am up here. I think it is quite obvious that enforced bilingualism is destroying the country outside Quebec. I really wonder where our English leaders are. Are they all out west? Who knows? I thought Bob Rae would wake up and realize that one of the reasons he won the election was because of Mr Peterson's support of the Speech Lake accord. David Peterson was not speaking for the majority of Ontario by supporting the accord, and I can only hope that Mr Rae does not do likewise to appease the French minority.

Canada is a multicultural country and always has been. There is nothing wrong with one common language to tie all cultures together in a common bond. Each ethnic group can grow and prosper within the community, bonded by that common language to other groups. Their own language, including French, can grow and prosper within their community.

People who believe in one common language for Canada can no longer be frightened off with words like "bigot." They have had enough. French outside Quebec deserves no more and no less formal a place in Canadian society than any other ethnic language or group. English is the bonding language of all Canadians, one common language to preserve and protect all multicultural heritage.

KENNETH D. McRAE

The Chair: Mr McRae?

Dr K. McRae: I thank you for this opportunity. I am here as a professional political scientist, and one who has made some studies of a number of other multicultural and multilingual countries with interests in language policy and language politics. I would gladly talk about these at some length but I will not infringe on your time.

My focus tonight is really on one major point. And I would like to make it as strongly as I can. I am concerned—I am sure you are, too—with the role of Ontario in Confederation, the thrust of its political strategy in Confederation at this time. I am not going to talk about specific measures, but rather the general line of policy, the direction that could be followed, the broad goal that could be pursued.

I do not need to take time to say that Ontario is a powerful figure in Confederation. We all know that. My thesis is a little stronger than that. My thesis really is that Ontario—I think here obviously of the government and the Legislature—almost by itself—I say almost—can prevent the breakup of Canada. I am sure this is a topic many of us agree upon even if we disagree on means.

How is this to be done? I see two consistent lines of action that would have to be pursued to do this.

First is a constant policy of flexibility, understanding and sympathy towards Quebec, of reaching out, of looking for accommodation, of talking and talking some more, of bending a little, putting our own points across, of being pragmatic, of avoiding the hard symbolism of which much of the debate is composed today, of staying away from legalistic logic where political pragmatism may find a way, of the overintellectualization of issues. I think almost of Mackenzie King's example here, who was so criticized by Frank Scott for precisely this ability to prevent issues from taking a hard edge and a hard shape.

The second line of action, I think, is even more important, and that is what not to do. I am concerned myself with the rise of much discourse among journalists and intellectuals on the debate on Canada after Quebec or Canada without Quebec. There is a new concept with us which is taking the form of the rest of Canada. Some people have even coined an acronym TROC for this, "the rest of Canada."

I submit to you that this is a dangerous idea. If we wanted to coin a slogan, I think we could say TROC is a crock. Very simply, I would say Ontario should not let this happen. The province of Ontario can refuse, if it wills, to join any form of alliance, coalition, or common front of the other provinces against Quebec. My reasoning is that without Ontario as a factor in this coalition, no such common front would be possible. With Ontario strongly neutral between the other provinces and Quebec, Confederation can survive.

2210

My suggestion would be that Ontario's policy should be friendship with both Quebec and with the other provinces, but alliances with neither side. A policy of neutrality, rather, if we had more time, like the traditional role of Bern canton in the Swiss Confederation, a powerful canton which provides a hinge or a bridge between German and French Switzerland.

If I have a minute or two more, I would like to suggest that there are three possible objections to this proposed solution.

The first is that this might produce a political stalemate. This is possibly so, but I would see separation as worse than stalemate. I think we could live for some time in a situation of stalemate and I think the economic and social costs of stalemate would be lower than those of separation.

The second objection: It is likely to produce a more decentralized Canada, and I would say probably so, but not so much as a breakup of Canada would produce in terms of its social impact, especially, and I would emphasize, for Ontario. We would be the ones that would feel it most if Quebec were to leave.

Third, and this is perhaps a more difficult one, what if the popular pressure, such as you have heard around you tonight, would not approve, would press you to get on the side of a bandwagon against Quebec? I would submit here that this is a bandwagon that ought to be resisted. It is a chance to show political leadership, political education, political dialogue, and I would hope that the government of Ontario and the Legislature of Ontario would be able to show that kind of leadership.

PAUL McRAE

The Chair: Sorry, sir. I thought we had concluded.

Mr P. McRae: I am Paul McRae. I thought you called me down.

The Chair: Sorry, I guess we had two McRaes on the list. All right.

Mr P. McRae: I thought you did.

The Chair: I had called Kenneth McRae, but all right, go ahead, sir, briefly, and we will conclude with you then.

Mr P. McRae: I do not want to move in where I am out of turn. Just a word of introduction: I formerly lived in Quebec. I was a principal of high schools in northern Ontario, in Manitoulin Island, Rainy River and 10 years in Thunder Bay, and served in the House of Commons for 12 years from that city, Fort William and Thunder Bay-Atikokan, and have been and am a member of the CRTC at the present time, whose chairman is off doing some similar job as you are doing here.

I am sorry to keep you so late, because I know what it is like to be serving on the other side. I was on the constitutional committee as an alternate and I went through that one, but mainly what I am here for is to talk about what really concerns me, and the relationship to the finance committee of the House of Commons, which I served on for many years.

I am here not to talk about structure, not to talk about the Constitution. I am here to talk about whatever happens when it is all over. We hope that Quebec is part of it and we pray that Quebec is part of it, but whatever happens, I make a strong plea that the final national instrument that develops from all of these discussions all across the country be strong enough to deal with the global economy and to deal with environmental problems of a global nature that could be catastrophic if countries like Canada do not take the lead. I think it is terribly important that the government of Canada, when this is all over, has that kind of power.

I would like to talk just for a moment about the global economy because I think this is something that we do not fully understand at this particular point. I think there is a very dangerous dichotomy that we have to deal with. One of them is that capital, whether it is liquid or equipment, is extremely mobile. A plant can move out of Ontario to Mexico and it can be set up in a week or two. The other part of that dichotomy, the other side of that dichotomy is the fact that people cannot move, unless you are very technical or unless you are a senior executive of that given company.

These two problems create immense difficulties for government and it is only those governments like Japan, West Germany and the United States—I am not even sure if the United States can make it at this particular point; it is these kinds of governments, the two that I mentioned, that are the ones we are going to be competing with.

I would suggest that your research bring to you some papers by Robert Reich, who is a Harvard economist, guru of the Democratic Party, who talks about the successful role of a national government in a global corporation sense. That national government has to spend a lot of time and energy developing national institutions, developing transportation, developing communications, developing educational programs that are totally relevant. These are the kinds of national governments that we have to have in this country; otherwise we do not survive.

Also, those governments have to look after people who are unable to look after themselves in this time of global turmoil. I would look at the European common market as one where, while they have entered into a major trade relationship, they are supporting weak governments, people, social systems, cultural systems and so on. Those are the kind of things that we require a national government to do. I feel very strongly that whatever the instrument that we forge after these many discussions, that instrument must contain that ability to do what I have said.

Only briefly—I will just be a second; I know that I am running you out of time—I would like to suggest that there are some very large, as you know, global environmental problems, particularly the ozone layer, the warming of the earth, that are not provincial problems. They are not the burial of garbage and so on. They are problems that deal with growth, with national economies, with energy matters with all kinds of other matters.

Again, it is not good enough for a weak federal government or for a weak national government—I use the word “national” because it always has struck me that the word we use that is wrong is “central.” I think it is possible to have a strong national government that is decentralized that has a very strong regional basis. I could go into this, promise you that what I will do is put it on paper and send it to you, because there are some other things I would like to talk about. But mainly my plea is to make sure that we have a national instrument that is powerful enough to deal with the kinds of things that you mention.

I will just give you one example of what happens when we do not use our power correctly. The Stone Corp bought Consolidated Bathurst just after the free trade deal went through, not necessarily as part of the free trade deal. It invested perhaps 5% equity, took the rest on loans from banks which are interest tax free, and as I understand it the \$1.5 billion, a good portion of it, went offshore. That capital is so mobile, it moves offshore immediately. These are some of the things that I think we have to look at, and before Quebec leaves, talk to people in Quebec about how important the solution to these problems is going to be for our future.

I thank you very much for your attention and I apologize for keeping you so late.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr McRae.

Interjection: Mr Chairman, I would like to register a complaint about how this session has been conducted here is evening in terms of time allocation. If you are going to sign and allot times, I would suggest that you respect—I am one who was missed out, and that is fine. It is too late now. The other thing is that your 800 number indicates very clearly that people would be registered on arrival in order of presentation, and you have been all over the map here.

The Chair: Well, no, sir. In fact, I have—

Interjection: Well, that is the understanding that I had.

The Chair: They were registered, sir. People were registered at the door and I have stuck fairly religiously to the list that was there.

Interjection: I am sorry, my name was second on the list, because I saw the list, and I was not called. That is all

right. I will submit my report separately, but I want it on the record that I am far from satisfied with the way you are conducting this. If you are leaving this kind of feeling behind in each community, then you are creating another problem.

The Chair: Sir, I would invite you to come up at the end of the meeting and look at the list, and you can see that in fact we have gone through it, almost as we have, with the two lists that I had and working from both of those. I invite you to do that.

Interjection: I have been here since 20 after 6.

The Chair: I am sorry. We are going to conclude at this point. I want to thank the people who came. The meeting is concluded.

The committee adjourned at 2221.

CONTENTS

Monday 25 February 1991

Jack Pickersgill	C-69
Students' Forum on Canadian Unity	C-69
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario	C-69
Direction-Jeunesse	C-69
New Federation	C-70
Fédération des femmes canadiennes-françaises de l'Ontario	C-70
Fédération des élèves du Secondaire franco-ontarien	C-70
Canadian Ethnocultural Council	C-70
Coalition for the Preservation of Aboriginal Language for Urban Natives	C-70
Faculté de droit l'Université d'Ottawa	C-71
Conseil de planification sociale d'Ottawa-Carleton, Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton	C-71
L'Union culturelle des franco-ontariennes	C-71
Afternoon sitting	C-71
Citizens Council of Canada	C-71
Association française de municipalités de l'Ontario	C-71
City of Ottawa's Advisory Council on Visible Minorities	C-72
Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens	C-72
Fédération des associations de parents francophones de l'Ontario	C-72
Mary Jackson	C-72
Mouvement des caisses populaires de l'Ontario	C-72
Corporation de la ville de Hawkesbury	C-72
Ottawa-Carleton Board of Trade	C-73
Fédération des aînés de l'Ontario	C-73
Chambre économique de l'Ontario	C-73
Evening sitting	C-74
Northern Foundation	C-74
Arthur Milner	C-74
Harry Bateman	C-74
Earl McKeen	C-74
Stuart Ross	C-74
Lucien Saumur	C-74
Council of Women of Ottawa and Area	C-74
Robert Edmonds	C-74
Civic Forum	C-74
Marianne McLean	C-75
Philip Capobianco	C-75
Michael Hahn	C-75
Tom Sloan	C-75
Terry Olsen	C-75
Charlene Leblanc, Deanna Milne	C-75
Monica Hylton	C-75
Association des juristes d'expression française de l'Ontario	C-75
Mike Rygus	C-75
Marvin Jason	C-75
K. Jean Cottam	C-75
Tony Sylvestro	C-76
Kenneth D. McRae	C-76
Paul McRae	C-76
Adjournment	C-76

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
ice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
eer, Charles (York North L)
hurley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)
ves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
arnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
arrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
alkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
ffer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)
ilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)
inninger, David (London South NDP)

stitution: Wilson, Gary (Kingston and The Islands NDP) for Ms Harrington

Also taking part:

hiarelli, Robert (Ottawa West L)
cGuinty, Dalton (Ottawa South L)

lerk: Manikel, Tannis

lerk pro tem: Brown, Harold

aff:

rummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office
aye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

1st Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

uesday 26 February 1991



Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 26 février 1991

Select committee on Ontario in Confederation

Comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Tuesday 26 February 1991

The committee met at 1012 in the Royal Canadian Legion, Cornwall.

The Chair: Good morning. If I could call the meeting to order. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation.

We are pleased as a committee to be here in Cornwall this morning, continuing our hearings across the province and hear from the people of the province of Ontario on the role of Confederation and Ontario's role within that. This is the fourth week of our travels in various parts of the province and we will be concluding our formal hearings later this week. We are continuing the swing this week through the eastern part of the province and ending up in Ontario later this week.

This is a committee that is made up of representatives of the three political parties that have representatives at Queen's Park, and I want to just take a minute to introduce members of the committee who are here. In addition to myself, from the New Democratic Party caucus we have Andy Malkowski; Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee; Marilyn Churley; Fred Wilson; David Winninger, and Gary Wilson. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer, and from the Conservative caucus we have Charles Mack.

We are, as I said earlier, in the Royal Canadian Legion in Cornwall, and I want to give the president of the Royal Canadian Legion, Ernie Pain, an opportunity to say a few words to us. Mr Pain.

Mr Pain: I say welcome, ladies and gentlemen, to room 297 in Cornwall. I do hope your meeting of the select committee of Ontario in Confederation is a very fruitful meeting. Also, I would like to say that I believe in our flag, one country, indivisible. That is my own opinion. I do think that each province should have a right to decide the fate of our country. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. Before proceeding with the list of speakers, I need to say first of all—and I realize the message out to those people who may be following over the parliamentary channel may not be adequately received and it will come out in terms of what I am about to say—we have had a problem apparently this morning, and technical people tell me, with the closed captioning. Whatever piece of equipment it is that makes that possible is unfortunately placed on a truck that was on its way to the next stop, and it is being retrieved as we speak. So for those people who are not receiving now closed captioning, I apologize for that. That, we hope, will be rectified as the morning proceeds.

The other thing is, in terms of the time for speakers, we are here in Cornwall, as we have had in various other locations, a number of people who are interested in speaking to us and to us. In an attempt to try to accommodate as

many individuals and groups as we can, we have had to set some time lines which are perhaps a little more stringent than we would have preferred to see. As you can see from the agenda if you have a copy, we have set aside a maximum of 15 minutes for organizations and a maximum of 10 minutes for individuals. There is a block of time later in the morning where there is about an hour's time, although I anticipate it will not take quite that long, where there is in fact a coalition of a number of organizations that have come forward. That is why that time block has been extended, because it quite frankly would have been longer if we had dealt with each of those organizations separately, given the number of them.

So just by way of asking people to do their best to try to stick to that time, I have tried to be a little bit flexible in that, although perhaps that has gotten me sometimes into trouble. But I think we need to try to maintain that time and also keep in mind that we would like to try to have some time within that maximum time for questions to be asked by members of the committee.

TASK FORCE ON CANADIAN FEDERALISM

The Chair: With that then, I will call our first presenters, from the Task Force on Canadian Federalism, Julius Grey, Anastasios Anastasopoulos and June Weiss.

Mr Grey: Thank you very much. It is a privilege to be here, even if only for 15 minutes, to tell you about what we have been doing and to give you perhaps to some extent a Quebec perspective but one which has, I believe, implications for Ontario. We are quite clear in the policy suggestions that we give to Ontario. We do not believe that Quebec problems are purely to be settled inside Quebec, nor Ontario ones purely within Ontario. We are one country and we have been working for that since the summer.

We are a non-profit, non-partisan group—we will not say non-political because that is a very different thing from being non-partisan—dedicated to the study and the promotion of Canadian federalism. We have presented to the Bélanger-Campeau commission and we have done a certain amount of publishing and organizing in Quebec. We have attached both a submission that we prepared for your study and a number of articles that we have published in various newspapers or that are in the process of publication, in one case in *Options*.

The question we want to put to you is this. It is clear that nobody says the status quo is the only way to do things, that the Canadian status quo is perfect, that the Constitution cannot be changed. It is also clear that all sensible voices in Quebec are now saying that the economic union must continue. In fact the Allaire report wants to strengthen it. Why is it then that no one can come up with a constitutional fix? The answer is, because the problems of Canada are not constitutional; because it is a foolish

illusion to believe that by changing the division of power, saying one little thing will become provincial instead of being federal, or the other way around, the daily lives of Canadians will be substantially improved. Indeed, that type of bargaining which the Allaire commission invites us to do would only lead to greater dissatisfaction, because a year after the division of powers those people who are obviously dissatisfied in some way would see that their lives are no better off than they ever were before and the demagogues would then say, "You see, we told you that the only way was to go all the way to full sovereignty."

It is therefore my suggestion that massive bargaining away of federal power is not the way to go. Even if one were to reapportion powers—of course, some things can be changed, and I have suggested certain areas where one could move from federal to provincial or from provincial to federal powers—but a massive giveaway of Ottawa powers will simply weaken us vis-à-vis the United States and other trading partners, make it impossible for us to negotiate effectively, especially inside this free trade area. But apart from that, it would be a disaster. What then is the solution? The solution is surely to ask ourselves what Canada is. Giving away powers without a clear vision of Canada will leave us with some sort of sovereignty association and so on.

Canada, I submit to you, is fundamentally made up of a number of points. On the last pages we list a number of them, that it must be a free society protected by the strongest of charters. And one thing I think we should stop feeling guilty about and say right out—it is in fact patronizing not to say it—is that much of the thrust of Quebec nationalism, not initially in the 1960s during the Quiet Revolution, but in recent years, has been unfair and has been an attack on public liberties.

A multicultural and bilingual society which increases the individual freedom of choice in cultural matters—that is the second essential point of Canada, the welfare state, the compassionate nature of Canadian society. I submit to you that any separatist solution, any weakening of the central fabric of Canada will make it impossible for us to afford that which makes us most different from the United States right now, and the prosperous and open society which we have because of our North American location, because we are able to take the best from the United States and not incorporate some of the less attractive features of that society. It seems to be that any constitutional discussions must preserve enough unity and enough federal power to create those things and under those circumstances a giveaway of federal power is simply unthinkable.

1020

How then is one to achieve it? I believe that bargaining on the basis of something like the Allaire report will not achieve it. It is obvious that even if Mr Bourassa and Mr Ryan are right and the Allaire report is not a final statement, they will not be able to back down substantially to leave sufficient federal power to maintain the essential aspects of Canada—the freedom, the multiculturalism and bilingualism across the country, the welfare state and the prosperity.

It is obvious that the only way to do it is for someone from outside, as well as people from inside like ourselves to campaign in Quebec and to weaken the apparent monopoly that they have had on the media. It is happening now; in the last two weeks there have been more and more voices coming out of Quebec saying: "Let's think about this. This is dangerous, at least economically." I think it is important for Ontario, for other Canadian provinces, for the federal government, to come to Quebec, to go from town to town, to go to Montreal and to Quebec City and to point out that Quebec was not rejected by the rest of the country; that is a misinterpretation of what happened at Meech—whatever position one takes on Meech Lake, in history, but it was not an attack on Quebec or a desire to remove Quebec; as I believe is the case, that all Canadians consider Quebec to be central and essential to Canada and consider the continuation of bilingualism and the French and English nature of Canada to be an essential part.

To campaign in Quebec in order to create a belief in Canada. Once that has happened, we can sit down with representatives of a Quebec government or of other—perhaps might think of other forms, estates general, whatever one wants—Canadians, Quebecers, everybody, and make constitutional amendments which, as I said, may be of some significance but which are not the central part of the Canadian problem.

I further say that the recognition of the specific, of the distinct, of the French nature of Quebec is not incompatible with all this. That should be done; everybody must understand that one of the fundamentals of Canada, with which we would not have this different society from the United States, is the Frenchness and the bilingualism of Quebec.

But I do not believe either that one should feel guilty about what Canada has done so far, that one should keep reiterating the sort of official half-truths or non-truths: Quebec nationalism; for instance, the great threat to Quebec, which is now pretty well established to be a myth; that one should say, "Of course you are right, but would you keep a few of the things?" The answer is we must keep a vibrant Canada in which all Canadians feel that it is more than just an economic union, just the common dollar. It does represent as an essentially different society from the one which we respect and like but do not want to participate in south of the border.

That is basically what I want to say. I would like to see Professor Anastasopoulos to add a few words about the economic side of our presentation.

Dr Anastasopoulos: I would like to stress that Canada has an economic problem, much less of a constitutional problem. In my opinion, it is becoming progressively less and less economically viable, and the seriousness of the problem is obscured by the intensity of the constitutional concerns. The reason for that is that the GATT agreements which are in the process and the United States free trade agreement, the United States-Mexico-Canada negotiations all point in the direction of two effects: first, strengthening the north-south route of trade against the east-west route of trade, and second, the decline in the manufacturing sectors. Some studies that we have conducted at Concordia University

ow that Canada as a whole, particularly Quebec and Ontario, is bound to lose in the area of manufacturing as a result of these developments.

Now, there are some additional considerations in the international area, like the economies of scale in multinationals, the appearance of flexible manufacturing. Another is the forecasted shortage of high interest rates as a result of accumulation of debts in North America and the decline in productivity in North American markets. All these factors point to the fact that in the future the various North American regions are going to face strong competition among themselves. As a result of that competition, the Canadian economy is bound to undergo a serious reorganization and a change in the pattern of trade and will face difficulty in maintaining its industrial bases.

There are some additional realities. Additional realities are the interprovincial barriers of trade that exist—some regulations prohibit or limit interprovincial trade—high federal and provincial deficits, serious regional disparities and federal-provincial disputes over social problems, the high tax burden in Canada. All these domestic issues point out that Canada has a serious problem. If things are left the way they are, the industries will move to the south. Competition among various regions is bound to taken each region of Canada individually.

What we recommend in this case is that we need strong, concerted economic efforts of the various Canadian regions in order to protect the Canadian industry from political interventions, because no matter how we look at it, competition among various regions is going to involve a lot of political interference. In this case the United States, being a much stronger economic unit, will be able to protect its regions much more effectively. To do so, we require a stronger federal government which has the ability to conduct economic policies effectively.

On the other hand, in order for the provinces to subscribe to a stronger federalism, they must be persuaded about the economic costs and benefits of federalism. Such costs and benefits must be based on new realities as they have emerged from new technology and tendencies towards globalization of the economies.

It is my firm belief that these topics, these economic realities, these costs and benefits, can only be sorted out through negotiations among provinces concentrating on the seriousness of economic problems and not obscuring it with Constitutional concerns. I think the threat of disintegration of the country has at the present gives us an opportunity to rebuild it on more sound foundations.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. Are there any more comments that you wish to make? There are a number of questions. We will try to get through as many as we can. Mr Offer to the floor.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation. I know that there are probably a number of questions, so I will be brief in the questions that I want to pose to you.

When you talk about the campaigning that you see as necessary in Quebec, do you see the essence of the campaigning directed to the economic realities, or something

more than that? I ask that question with this in mind. When one talks about the economic realities of leaving the country, or whatever configuration one wants to model, there may be the argument that says, "Take a look at the reduction in federal transfer payments to the provinces." I am wondering how one addresses that particular point.

My second point is, do you see that it is necessary that there be constitutional amendment in order to effect a redistribution of power?

Mr Grey: I would answer both questions in the following way.

Economics is not enough, in our view. The reason for economics not being enough is of course because nationalism, by its nature, is irrational. The definition of nationalism is the exploitation by a few who have an economic interest of the prejudices of the many. No matter how good an argument you have, if you come up with an economist who is unimpeachable, there will be an economist called Tremblay who will say the opposite. The nature of irrationalism is that you believe Tremblay rather than Anastasopoulos, no matter who is right.

1030

So the purely economic interest argument will not work. Also, the purely economic argument has this disadvantage: What if there is a brief period of time in which it is not paying, if you can show that Quebec has subsidized something. You cannot have a family or a union or anything based on one party constantly benefiting or walking out if it is not.

Therefore, it will be necessary to inspire a belief in Canada which can only be done, not by economic interests which will at most get people like Bouchard or Parizeau to say, "All right, let's concede one area in a monetary law," if the going gets hot, just modify their position, but something we will have to face right on. Economics is not enough. Federal transfer payments are not the issue. The issue is: Can we keep this compassionate, free society in a very different type of thing with this gigantic neighbour breathing down our necks?

So the first question would be that economics is essential but it is not the only question. We will not win if we concentrate only on economics. I think the campaigning would surely involve the leaders. We are non-partisan, but I think the Prime Minister of Canada has failed to campaign so far, and I think it would take not just the Prime Minister but the Prime Minister, the opposition leader, the federal NDP, the various provincial premiers and oppositions to make it non-partisan, to tell Quebecers, "We want you."

Your second question was—

Mr Offer: My second question dealt with whether constitutional amendment is necessary in order to effect the distribution of power.

Mr Grey: I think constitutional amendment is really not necessary in the logical sense. I think Quebec already has all the powers; indeed, Quebec has used more powers than other provinces and has made itself de facto distinct.

I believe that as a practical matter of common sense, all constitutions can be improved and probably in the present situation it would be impractical to leave the matter without

some constitutional amendment, but I do not believe that constitutional amendment is the key to redistribution of Canada. At most, it is one of the things that will happen on the way. Our error is concentrating on section 91 and 92 of the BNA Act, or the Constitution Act as it now is, instead of looking at the real problems.

Mr F. Wilson: Thank you for your presentation. We are entering the final week of the first phase of our deliberations here. We have heard from many different groups within the province; whether we have heard it in anger, in hope or in frustration, the feeling we are getting is that Canada is definitely worth saving, doing almost anything within reason to save what we realize as Canada. As members of your committee and as Quebecers, beyond the demagoguery, beyond the media hype, can you give us some kind of feeling of what you are getting from the Quebec people?

Mr Grey: We have got a tremendous number of positive comments for what we have done. After our Bélanger-Campeau commission presentation, at which we were insulted and called every name, I had dozens of phone calls at my office from francophones and anglophones. Indeed, our task force is made up of a lot of francophones as well as anglophones, and one of my basic principles is that I refuse to accept the distinction. I speak French as much as I speak English; I would have no difficulty speaking to you in French. In the same way, I do not see why, because of my name, the label is put on me. That is one of the irrational aspects of nationalism.

I believe that most Quebecers would like this to go away. On the other hand, I think the way in which Quebec is different from other provinces is not that it has a greater number of rednecks—far from it. Quebec has always had very many tolerant, open people, the same as any other place, but it is the distribution of the nationalism; the journalistic world, the university world, the business-labour world—labour unions in Quebec are an obvious example acting against their economic interest, being more nationalistic than anyone else when they are the ones who have the most to lose.

The leaders of English Canada tend to have a lower percentage of this sort of nationalistic, narrow thinking, even though in the whole society it is probably the same. The conclusion would be that if you have more among the leadership groups you probably have a much larger silent majority thinking to itself, "If only this could go away."

I believe that if Ontarians and people from other provinces come to Quebec and go not just to Montreal and not just to one meeting where they are going to get booed and called names, but all over the province, the reception will be overwhelming. People will jump at that, saying, "This is what we wanted to hear." I think there are many people, deep down, who are sick and tired of the nationalism. We have been hearing it all the time. It is the media and the so-called official positions that are so difficult to breach.

Mr F. Wilson: Just to finish on that note, that method you describe of getting to the Quebec people sounds like a very good way of doing it: We go and deliver a message. I have the feeling, though, that that may be looked upon as a

bit of an invasion by those very forces you described might be counterproductive.

Mr Grey: They would certainly call it an invasion but the precise answer to that is that we are in the same country. It is not as though a group of Americans or Englishmen or Frenchmen came to Canada. This is still the same country. One of the issues that has been raised by the nationalists is: "They have rejected us." What more significant thing than for Canadians outside Quebec to go to Quebec and say, "That was a total misinterpretation."

Whatever motives one ascribes to either Mr Wells or Mr Harper or anybody else, the rejection of Quebec is clearly not one of them. As I said, there are some rednecks in English Canada, undoubtedly, who reject Quebec, but they were not the ones who either voted against Mr. Lake or who have any important influence over the policies of Canada or of Quebec.

So I suggest that although there would be this immediate sense of, "You are coming to our home and invading us," the answer is: "We are Canadians coming to explain why we want to save Canada to other Canadians." We are not going to a foreign country. We cannot accept the premises of the nationalists before doing anything. I think the campaign in Quebec is an essential part of saving Canada.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation. We appreciate the fact that you left us a copy of your presentation, the Bélanger-Campeau commission as well as other materials, and we will see that people from the committee have access to those. Thank you once again.

1040

MOHAWK COUNCIL OF AKWESASNE

The Chair: Could I call next from the Mohawk Council of Akwesasne Chief Mary David and Grand Chief Michael Mitchell. Also with the presenters is Micha Menczer.

Mr Mitchell: My brothers and sisters, on behalf of the Mohawk community of Akwesasne, I want to welcome you to this area. I want to thank you for the opportunity to meet with you. We have words on paper, as you requested. It is far too long to read it in 15 minutes, so what I have chosen to do is highlight some of those things we have brought out.

Akwesasne is a Mohawk-speaking community with about 9,500. Our territory is split into boundaries encompassing the United States, Canada, Ontario, Quebec and New York state. Our people have to live daily in a situation where there are five government jurisdictions and authorities. Every time you leave the territory you have some legal on the outside that you are confronted with and deal with on a daily basis. There are international roads and borders and boundaries that affect our people on a daily basis.

On the Canadian side, there are 2,000 living on Cornwall Island, Ontario; another 2,000 in St Regis village; another 2,000 in Snye. St Regis and Snye are in Quebec, Cornwall in Ontario, so about 6,000 people reside on the Canadian side of Akwesasne.

We have become very concerned as we watch from afar your deliberations and discussions on the future of Canada, because we have yet, as indigenous people,

ve the discussions that need to be had regarding finding a place, within Canada. I note on page 13 that you have some information and questions for discussion: How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal people? I say to you, you must come to grips with who our people are. The very notion that our people have to live among a society in Canada that refers to the English and the French as being the two founding nations of Canada—

I will go back even further than that. Next year your people will be celebrating the 500-year anniversary of a man who was lost. At that time, we welcomed the early European settlers and shared our land, what is now known as North America. We shared many things with European society: medicine, food, other things to help sustain life.

Our people had a respect for the land, the environment, and having a right to live beside humans. Our people recognized that all living things had a place; this is all the Creator's doing. We were branded as pagans, that we did not have a religion. We are now finding 500 years later that we are choking the life out of our mother. We could be a bit of knowledge from the indigenous people.

What is wrong with the country, according to our perception, is that they have systematically choked, through systems within government and not being able to accord respect in their dealings with aboriginal people. From the first time of aboriginal relations, treaties were made, many promises were made, and then it came down to colonization, systematically putting policies in place and reducing that was once a very proud race of people to what is now known by the majority of the citizens in Canada as a welfare state.

I want to flip the other side. I want to tell you how we live things. We cannot get out of these tragic statistics—high rates, unsafe water, inadequate sewage, etc. On a reservation we are deprived and living under these conditions. We live like that because Canada has taken our pride away—you have probably heard in many of the presentations, if aboriginal leaders have appeared before you—by the residential schools, government bureaucracy, policies that affect aboriginal people. We have come all the way down to be put in such a state.

Many of our people no longer know who they are. Many of them are fast losing their language and culture, and they cannot be somebody else. We cannot go back to our country, because this is where we come from. You took our culture away. Your government put these laws on our people to reduce us, and we are going to have to rebuild it. You are going to have to allow aboriginal people to rebuild their culture, strengthen their culture and traditions. You are going to have to allow us to keep our languages and keep our lands and you are going to have to let us recognize that we have aboriginal rights.

Yesterday I got back from Mexico. I saw while I was touring their country great buildings—pyramids, I guess they call them. A great civilization was there before the European arrived—Mayans, Aztecs, many wonderful things that happened. But I had a look at the living conditions of aboriginal people there, living in shacks and probably the same conditions. But their will is very strong, and in Canada the will of

aboriginal people is still very strong, right across the country. The focus for us is on self-determination.

In Akwesasne we have attempted to come to grips with being an international border community, let alone an aboriginal international community. We have experienced our share of problems, because there are just too many government policies and laws, or lack of laws, in different areas. We have a police force. We have a judicial system on the Canadian side, limited as it is. On the American side of Akwesasne there is no police force, no justice model of any kind. It is a guaranteed recipe for trouble.

The distinction between Canada and the United States is sometimes that they refer to Akwesasne as "our Canadian Mohawks," so the Americans will call us "our American Mohawks," and the discussion has been going back and forth. Where it involves Ontario and Quebec, usually there is neglect in past years. Just for statistics purposes, over the past 25 years it virtually has been left untouched in terms of any assistance.

They will say, "You are a federal responsibility." Three years ago I invited Quebec and Ontario, New York state, Washington, Ottawa. We sat together like this and I said: "Why can you not all work with us to improve Akwesasne? Why can we not all sit together like our forefathers sat together when they built this country? Why is it so difficult for you to recognize that we have a tradition and we have a law, Mohawk that it is, and assist us? Help us survive and have a society that is predominantly Mohawk."

1050

We started and Ontario was a principal player. I must point out that a few weeks ago I met with your Premier and I told him of our desire that our culture and tradition and laws, the basis for self-government and self-determination, be based so that our culture survives. Ideas on self-government: The premise is that it is predominantly Mohawk law but it will have links to Ontario, to Quebec, to Canada, to the United States, but we will survive. Your Premier said, "If your idea of sovereignty, self-determination, self-government is based on the premise of law and order and justice, then we should be able to sit down at the table with you for you to show us, enable us to understand how it is going to operate, how it is going to link up."

Last of all I want to get back to those two founding nations. I have always had difficulty going to school. I went to school here in Cornwall. I have heard that from just a small young one. It is hard for me to accept that we did not have a place in your history. It is kind of like, "Break it in half and you will have his story." I had to be a part of that and listen to it. I had to try to believe in the cowboy-Indian mentality that you are the good guys and I am the bad guy. I refuse to believe that.

What we propose is to work together. If you want to build a greater Canada, then you have to look at aboriginal people in a different light. You have to stop trying to deny to yourselves what our role was in Canada's history. We have to change many misconceptions that you people perpetuated on your citizens and find a true place. That is the only way that you will find aboriginal people accepting and stop living a lie.

The United States Congress, 1888, 18 November, passed a bill recognizing the Iroquois Confederacy, of which the Mohawk nation is a member, as being the sole inspiration for the development of the Constitution of the United States, the great United States of America turning around and honouring an aboriginal group for the inspiration of its principles of self-government. Democracy came from aboriginal people, and yet in Canada we, of Haudenosaunee Iroquois, do not have a place. I draw that analogy to give you something to think about.

I am not saying that living conditions in the United States for aboriginal people are any better. In some aspects they are probably worse. What I am saying is that there is a lot of work and it is not just between the French and the English. It involves looking at it and saying: "We cannot go back 500 years, look at the conditions as they were without recognizing the fact that the aboriginal people welcomed us to this land. This is Onkwehonwe land, who shared this land with us."

Today the very same people are trying to find their place in Canada. I think that because of these hearings, we get an opportunity to tell you what we think. Many of our words are in here that are far more technical. If you want to ask me legal and technical questions, I have with me, to my right, Chief Mary David, who gave me the inspiration for a lot of the things that are written here. She has been involved in Akwesasne politics and community life a lot longer than I have. This is our presentation, such as it is.

The Chair: Let me just tell you that I think I speak for the committee in expressing our appreciation for the passion and the reason and the combination of those two with which you have made your point of view known to us. I can tell you that we have heard in our hearings across the province a number of native leaders and other natives talking to us and the message has been consistent and the same. I can also tell you, even more heartening, that we have heard from a number of non-native speakers who have also supported very clearly this willingness to finally sit down and try to address some of the injustices that we perpetuated towards our native people.

So I think the general will is there, and we know that the solutions can only come by sitting down together, as you have identified, as our Premier has identified, in working those problems through. We have gone the time, but if there are questions, I would be happy to allow one or two.

Mr Winninger: There are a number of questions I would like to ask you, Mr Mitchell, but because this is a constitutional committee, I am just going to put one to you. Being in Akwesasne and straddling the border as you do, you have presented some of the complexity of dealing with five different levels of government. On a more limited scale, we have heard the same complaint before with regard to falling between the cracks, between the provincial and the federal levels of government.

I wonder if you have any insights on how we might change our Constitution so that it would be easier to resolve some of the abuses of the past that you have alluded to, and restore to you your self-determination and self-government. Are there any mechanisms, constitutional

changes that might facilitate that which you could address briefly today?

Mr Mitchell: I will give you some examples, I guess I will try to do this in the fastest time possible. It is hard to give a reply. You have a loaded question here. We have sit down and have an understanding of what our aboriginal rights are. In this document it talks about aboriginal rights that have not been recognized or have been legislated and reduced, that it means nothing. I also presented that you have denied us a right to our existence, a right to a lifestyle where we can have pride and identity. That has been taken away. In that Constitution that you are trying to strengthen there was a section in there that is vacant and when it went to Britain and it came back, they said, "We'll deal with our aboriginal people over five years." We talked and we talked and we talked and we came up with nothing.

Instead of having the premiers discuss it, we have to sit down with aboriginal leaders and let them come in with something, like we are doing now, saying: "This is how you wish to be treated. This is the kind of relationship we want to have, so we can keep our pride and we can keep our integrity, and we can rebuild our nations." I think in a general way that is a very important place to start from.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You are a very articulate man. You said you had trouble with school. It certainly does not show this morning.

You were very explicit in giving us the numbers of people from your reservation who live in the different areas. Do you have representation now approaching the present government in Quebec at the same time, in the same way, in that they have hearings going on in different patterns at the moment? Have you made representations? I guess my real bottom-line question is, do you see a role for yourself in the Ontario-Quebec conversation, negotiating whatever word you want to use, at this crucial time, being that you are in such a pivotable spot geographically to the whole thing?

Mr Mitchell: Because of that word you just said "pivotable," we are forced to be there; we do not have a choice. If we do not go, such as the case in the past, we just get ridden right over and laws get made for us. We have to appear at these places to make known our views and our positions and our concerns, more than to be brought in and then just rolled into another statistic, another segment within Quebec or Ontario.

My main purpose in coming down here is to send out a signal and say, "Take your barriers and your boundaries, move them back and recognize that there is a Mohawk community here, a Mohawk territory that exists, and let's start from there."

1100

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you presented to any of the Quebec groups? I just wanted to know that.

Mr Mitchell: We have sent out that we are willing to do the same thing we are doing here and we have not got a reply. Chief Mary David would like to respond to that.

Ms David: Just to add to what Chief Mitchell in his answer replied to your question, when I was asked to come to this, I had to sit back and think, "Should we really

involved in a provincial hearing such as this?" It is typical the way people think. When you ask about making a presentation to Quebec, like the chief said, we have offered, we have not—I do not know if it has come about or not. But we do not see ourselves as residents of Quebec or residents of Ontario. We are Akwesasne. When such a question comes up, we think: "Well, we've got nothing to do with the provinces. Should we really be there?" Then you have to start from that starting point and come back to reality: "Yes, we do. If we don't they won't know what we're thinking and where we're going."

Mrs Y. O'Neill: As you see from our discussion paper, your issues are certainly one of our chief priorities.

Mr Mitchell: Just a note: In our community we do not have a flag. You see, sovereignty, self-determination, you cannot give it to us; it is up to us to define that. There is a sense of peace in the centre. Our whole philosophy, the system in our society is based on peace. Our laws are based on peace and to relate to one another. The Great Law of Peace was given to us by our Peacemaker and it has become our symbol in Akwesasne, and nowadays more than ever we try to promote the idea of justice, honesty, a good way of life, and you cannot give that to us. We have to fight and we have to rebuild and put pride back in our community. You cannot give us sovereignty.

I just came back from Mexico on a Haudenosaunee passport and I have a Mexican government stamp. I have other governments on here, including Canada and the United States. You cannot be afraid of the word "sovereignty" in terms of relating to aboriginal people. There has always been a clearly defined relationship on what we can respect from each other.

I think that word that throws everyone off, because I know you are dealing with another issue. But for us we have always had it, and from that context. It has been coded in terms of the relationship, because we have never let down and said: "This is the way we like ours to be. This is the relationship we would like to have." So with that, I want to thank each and every one of you for giving me this time to appear before you, and excuse my English.

The Chair: No, you do not have to excuse it at all, and we thank you for coming and talking to us.

Could I call next from the Cornwall and District Chamber of Commerce, Dennis Thibeault. Is Mr Thibeault here? No? Okay, we will go on and come back to them if they appear later.

CORNWALL AND DISTRICT MULTICULTURAL COUNCIL

The Chair: From the Cornwall and District Multicultural Council, Colm Stockdale. Mr Stockdale, perhaps you would introduce the other members of your delegation for the record so we have them.

Mr Belmonte: [Remarks in Italian]

I present the president of Cornwall and District Multicultural Council, Mr Stockdale, and the secretary-treasurer, Sara Gill. I am Joe Belmonte, member of the council, and I represent the environment committee of the city of Cornwall.

Mr Stockdale: I do not know, Mr Chairman, if you have instantaneous translation but that was Italian for those of the members who did not recognize the language.

The Chair: Some of us did.

Mr Stockdale: Thank you for giving the Cornwall and District Multicultural Council the opportunity to present a brief to the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. I would like to welcome you to Cornwall. The process we used is that we represent 20 different ethnic groups from around the world who are Canadians, and proud to be Canadians. The brief I am presenting here today is a consensus we achieved from the questions in your pamphlet, the questions for discussion, and these are the ones we will address here today. I have a copy, if you wish, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Yes, we would.

Mr Stockdale: I would like to begin with the first question we were asked to address, "What are the values we share as Canadians?"

It was something, I think, unique among Canadians and we as different ethnic groups and from different countries who have come to Canada by choice or for various reasons—the first question we set down is what we see as values as Canadians. We discovered we are about the only country, we believe, that has to ask itself: Why are we unique? What makes us Canadians?

This is different because I am Irish originally; I am now Canadian, and Joe here alongside me is Italian originally, now Canadian, and Sara is from India. We had never any doubt in our mind when growing up or before we came to this country asking ourselves: What are we, where do we see ourselves, where do we come from or why are we here? We ask what our purpose is or what our values are. It is very clear to us. But we seem to be always asking ourselves as Canadians: What are our values? What makes us so unique? Why are we different from Quebec? Why are we different from British Columbia? Why are we different from the USA? This was something I think is uniquely Canadian. It makes people uniquely Canadian by having to ask that question.

Our first one, "What are the values we share as Canadians?" We want to emphasize more or less the multicultural policy of this government of the province. I know you will get some very good ideas from a lot of talented or gifted people that will give a lot of ideas, so our focus is mainly on the multicultural aspect we see as the problem in Canada today.

We believe in multiculturalism as a policy for Canada. Canada's policy on multiculturalism, I think, is unique in the world. Canada explicitly recognizes diversity as a source of dynamism and strength. The people of Canada now recognize the economic contributions made by our ethnocultural groups and the various diversity that we have and the tremendous additional reserve of business skills and energy that exists within this element of the business and industrial community from the various groups and backgrounds, and we bring a lot of benefit, we believe, to the Canadian economy and Canadian business in the way we do things.

1110

We fully support and encourage any and every effort the Ontario government makes to enhance our cultural uniqueness. We believe unlimited immigration should be our fundamental policy. Canada is a vast country. Immigrants must eat and have a place to sleep, so they create demand for and consume our products. We would like to see that the philosophy in government and with the people of Canada is that each new immigrant is a new industry. Some Canadians may fear that immigrants will take their jobs, but this really has never been proven or demonstrated to any degree.

Ontario educational systems cannot meet the demand by our industry for skilled tradespeople. In fact, the recruiting base for skilled tradespeople very often is to go to the western world and bring in recruiting. This, we believe, saves the Canadian taxpayer millions of dollars in direct training costs; because they already bring in skilled people they do not have to absorb that training expense.

We believe the government should educate the public about the positive benefits of immigration. We believe the spirit of multiculturalism is an ongoing process. Unity is enhanced each time Canadian ethnic groups come together in face to face situations. It is the consensus of our multicultural group that distrust is reduced when we have contact with people who are different from us.

I might add that we have a festival here in Cornwall which is a very successful festival, where our multicultural groups get together to celebrate being Canadian. We have it on the Sunday closest to 1 July, where various groups exhibit their songs and dances, and we also share our cuisines with the rest of Ontarians, the different flavours and foods we have. It goes very well. That is something we as individuals work well together on, and I think all Canadians can do the same. By seeing the differences it reduces misunderstandings, and we come to discover that we are more alike than we are different. These are the values that our group would like to share as Canadians.

We also address the economy. How can we secure a future in the international economy? Canada, as a developed nation, has one of the lowest percentages of gross national product spent on research and development and new technologies and innovation. We find this unacceptable and a threat to our future economic wellbeing. It has been said that there are more trade barriers between provinces in Canada than there are in the European Community.

I was talking about this multicultural festival. We try to get our own country's beer to give added flavour to the festival, and sometimes we may want a particular brand that is available in Quebec or British Columbia or any other province. It is easier for us to get beer from India or Ireland or Italy than it is to get it from British Columbia or Quebec, just down the road. We urge the government to show leadership in negotiating to reduce or remove these trade barriers between the provinces.

The laws of the provinces should also be harmonized. My son was able to drive at the age of 16 in Ontario, but if I were to move to another province, say Nova Scotia, he would not legally be able to drive in that province because

the age is 18. The law should be harmonized to some extent.

Encouragement by tax incentives should be given to manufacturers to export finished products rather than raw materials. We see Canadians as being hewers of wood and drawers of water. We can keep jobs in Ontario by going whole hog with the process rather than exporting our raw materials and producing jobs for other countries.

Productivity is important for Canadians to remain competitive in today's world, and we suggest that a quality service award be established by the Ontario government, like, for instance, the Japanese award system for service industries that promote service and quality. There is a Canadian government award, the federal government, but it is not well promulgated, or the criteria are not that well established. We would also like to see financial incentives attached to our industries and businesses in connection with these awards to make our businesses more effective.

One of the main concerns of the multicultural community is that we have a policy of good environmental management. Reduce, reuse and recycle should be our governing principle in the way we do business. The manufacturers and producers of packaging on products should be responsible for the disposal or recycling of the used container or wrapping, and not the municipalities. Companies should be levied a fee or charge before the product comes to market which could be credited back by way of the tax system for reusing the container or package. Make them ultimately responsible for the packaging. We commend the NDP government for its good policies in this important area.

We request that we have a fair taxation system and that a basic rate of 20% apply to individuals and corporation with social safety nets in place for the poor and disadvantaged. Governments should have balanced budgets in good times and only incur deficits in lean years, like recession or depressions. These are some of the ideas that our group has suggested for addressing our economy.

One of the important points on which we had some discussion was the role the federal and provincial governments play, which maybe gave rise to this commission. We really do not see anything wrong with our present parliamentary system. I do not think it is so perfect that it cannot be fixed or addressed, but as politicians I am sure you have quite a lot of ideas on how that could be achieved.

We do, however, have some difficulties with our Senate as it is presently constituted, and we have some suggestions for reform. We recommend that members of the Senate should be appointed by the government of the day of each province, territory, and our native peoples. Senators would be appointed by the provincial government for the duration of that government's mandate; three members from each province or territory, regardless of the population base, and three from national bodies representing our native people. The concept that the Senate should be the house of sober second thought should be maintained.

We believe another constitutional change should be made to have unified school boards in Ontario. School can retain their own religious objectives or programs, but they should have shared administration, maintenance and busing. As a taxpayer, it is very disconcerting to see three

four buses coming down our roads picking up different people and going in different directions. This is an expense of a duplication of service, a horrendous waste of the taxpayers' money.

How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal people? Maybe we are lucky to follow Chief Mitchell; he gave us some interesting comments. We believe the aboriginal people should be recognized as a force to be dealt with by the governments of Canada. The government should recognize the treaties and agreements in no matter what form, and it should negotiate in good faith. The Ontario government should make every effort to improve the quality of life for our aboriginal communities.

Of all the questions we asked, the one on which we had the strongest opinions—I guess this is typical of Canadians—is about the roles of the English and French languages in Canada. The multicultural council of Cornwall is strongly opposed to any legislated language for Ontario, i.e. for Ontario to become a bilingual province. English and French should be used as the marketplace demands, not as determined by governments. This issue has given rise to very strong feelings.

20

It is our opinion that bad laws are creating the conflicts, not the English or French peoples who have lived in harmony for many years with the other ethnic groups in Canada. I would only have to recognize that languages other than French and English are spoken in Ontario; our different ethnic groups all speak their own language in their own homes. We polled our group and a surprising result emerged. Most of our groups, when surveyed, clearly indicated that they were willing to live with the language of the majority and maintain their own language at home. The question arose: If 25% of the population was made up of Italian-speaking people—Mr Chairman, you have an Italian background—should they be serviced in Italian?

We are constantly told by governments that nobody will lose their job on account of bilingualism. I think the flip side is never mentioned, that is, that you have less chance of obtaining a job in government or will not be promoted if you are not bilingual. A lack of French is an obstacle to promotion.

I have my own experience of that. I work for the federal government. I obtained recently a promotion, and I was given a diagnostic test to tell the language teachers how long it would take me to learn a language. The federal government allows you a year. I came out at 15 months, so I did not meet the language requirements and therefore did not get the promotion. This is what bilingualism means in the federal public service. More disheartening, however, is that those who try to learn do so in the face of often artificially high standards of fluency to qualify for jobs where French is rarely or never used. I think this is something that should be addressed.

We recognize the very real fear that francophones have of being assimilated by English-speaking Canada, but it seems they have enough protection and services in place to alleviate this fear. We recognize it is very real. We do not know what the solution is. We know the French want to be

French first and then maybe Quebecers and Canadians later. I think this has given rise to the problem.

The other question is what we see as—I do not have it in our notes; I did not get time to publish it, due to short notice—Quebec's future in Canada. If the Allaire report is the basis for negotiation, I think we are in grave difficulty in this country. I understand why this commission is seeking the views of all Canadians, in other provinces as well, because we do not want to see Canada balkanized and broken up. Quebec has the problem. I do not know how we can fix Quebec's problem to make them feel more comfortable with us, to live with us as Canadians and to recognize themselves as also being Canadians.

Many of us in the multicultural council feel that Quebec is just another ethnic group. I know they have other aspirations, being a founding people, but if you look at the English, the other side, it is made up of all different groups, as I mentioned in my opening remarks. We cannot give you any assistance whatsoever, unfortunately, on this aspect.

I would like to thank you for your time and for listening to our comments.

The Chair: I think we will have to move on, because time is pressing, but I do want to thank you for the presentation addressing a number of the issues in the discussion paper. We realize on your last point that that is an issue that is going to be important for us to address. I do want to say, however, that the many Franco-Ontarians who have talked with us over the last three weeks—I want to be clear—see themselves as Canadians first and as Ontarians, and it is not a situation of seeing themselves as anything different. In that context of Canadian versus anything else, it is the same kind of attitude you started out with, believing we are all Canadians, that we come to Canada from various backgrounds and with various cultures and languages. The francophone organizations and individuals are saying to us that there is a particular place for the language and culture they have, that they also want us to see what we can do to help them retain that, particularly within Ontario. I think a lot more discussion needs to go on about that among all of us so we can better understand each other on that. But thank you once again for your presentation.

COALITION DES ORGANISMES FRANCOPHONES DE STORMONT, DUNDAS ET GLENGARRY

The Chair: We have next a coalition of francophone organizations.

J'invite maintenant les membres de ce groupe, la Coalition des organismes francophones; il y a en cinq. Peut-être que je vous laisse l'occasion de vous présenter.

M. St-Aubin : Nous sommes de fait une coalition de divers représentants de la communauté francophone de cette région. Chacun, à tour de rôle, vous donnera un portrait de la vie francophone de cette région et ce que ça peut représenter en fait de vie et de nos besoins.

Je pense qu'il est important de souligner dès le début que les personnes que vous voyez devant vous sont de fait canadiennes à part entière. Nous sommes conscients que nous vivons des heures très difficiles pour notre pays et je pense tout simplement qu'il faut lancer un appel à tous les

Ontariens, que même s'il s'agit d'un hiver très long, nous devons surmonter peut-être la fatigue d'entendre parler de ces questions parce que nous le devons à nos ancêtres. Puisqu'on se trouve dans la salle de la Légion, nous le devons à ceux qui sont morts sur le champs de bataille pour notre pays et nous le devons à nos enfants de trouver la solution à cette situation.

Nous vous soumettons que nous ici, de cette région, avons tout de même une perspective qui peut vous être utile. Parce que nous sommes une région frontalière, les contacts avec nos amis, notre parenté, les contacts d'affaires sont constants avec la région environnante. Montréal est à un peu moins d'une heure d'ici. Nous sommes certainement inquiets de la situation mais nous avons aussi une sensibilité d'une part à l'égard de l'aspiration de la province de Québec, qui cherche tout de même à sortir d'un contexte qui ne lui convient plus, qui cherche à poursuivre une vision d'un peuple qui n'est pas tout simplement une province comme les autres.

Nous aurons des présentations individuelles. Je me permets — parce que de par ma formation je suis avocat — de vous parler de certaines perspectives juridiques. J'ai eu l'honneur d'être l'avocat responsable de la Loi sur les services en français. J'ai eu l'honneur d'être l'avocat responsable de bâtir un système judiciaire bilingue en Ontario. Je pense donc que je sais ce dont je parle. Il y a des façons d'en arriver, je pense, à des gestes très importants pour que notre province à cette étape-ci communique un message. Vous savez, un avocat n'est pas sensé vous parler de cette question. Mais il est évident que nous vivons, je pense, une crise d'amour dans notre pays.

Essentiellement, nous avons de la part du peuple québécois — parce que, évidemment, les médias nous communiquent plus facilement les messages négatifs que les messages positifs ; c'est leur nature — nous avons les messages d'une part des drapeaux piétinés de Brockville qui sont communiqués dans presque tous les foyers du Québec. Nous avons, hélas, les messages très concrets, très positifs de votre gouvernement, de celui qui vous a précédé et même de celui qui a précédé celui-là. Ces messages-là rentrent très difficilement dans les foyers du Québec. D'un côté, on vous dira que ce qui se passe chez les minorités francophones n'a pas d'importance pour le Québec. Par contre, sur presque chaque levée d'une personne qui invoque son appartenance à la souveraineté on va souligner les événements, comme je l'ai mentionné, de Brockville.

1130

Je pense donc que, avec le climat de la défaite de l'accord du Lac Meech qui très évidemment a été une insulte pour le Québec à cause d'un processus franchement qui n'avait ni queue ni tête, un processus imposé dans la constitution de 1982 où il fallait que 11 législatures adoptent ces modifications, c'était une structure toute faite pour être défaite. Le message doit donc être communiqué et communiqué vite qu'il y a façon pour cette grande province dont je me compte très fier d'être un citoyen, un citoyen natif de cette province, avec mes ancêtres ici depuis au-delà de 200 ans, que cette grande province puisse communiquer dans la constitution du Canada certaines dispositions qui enchâsseraient, qui rehausseraient à un niveau

constitutionnel des dispositions qui sont de fait déjà dans nos lois, qui sont déjà dans la Loi sur les services en français.

La partie de la Charte des droits qui traite des droits linguistiques — on parle surtout des articles 16 à 22 — sans vous faire un parcours de tous ces éléments, je peux vous dire que si on fait la comparaison entre ces dispositions et le texte, d'une part, de la Loi sur les services en français et de la Loi sur les tribunaux judiciaires de l'Ontario qui gouverne les tribunaux, nous verrons que ces dispositions sont déjà en vigueur en Ontario. Donc, passer un signal d'amour qui serait celui d'enchâsser ces dispositions dans la constitutions n'exige pas beaucoup du corps politique ontarien.

Par contre, il y a une disposition dans cette charte l'article 16, qui parle d'égalité linguistique, qui n'est pas en fonction en Ontario. Je suis ici pour vous dire que je suis aussi sûr que les rédacteurs de la charte de 1982 n'avaient pas sûrement la prétention qu'ils étaient sur le mont Sinai recevant les commandements de Dieu. La Charte des droits et libertés peut sûrement faire l'objet d'une réflexion et de nouvelles dispositions. Cet article 16, à mon avis, n'est pas nécessairement à être adopté par l'Ontario pour qu'on nous ayons un véritable message convenable.

Je me limite à ces soumissions. Je pense qu'il est important que vous entendiez parler de la vitalité de cette communauté et de ces besoins.

M. Robert : Je m'appelle Émile Robert. Je suis maintenant représentant de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, ACFO — régionale de l'Estrie. Merci de nous avoir permis de vous transmettre notre point de vue sur la direction que devrait prendre l'Ontario dans le Canada de demain.

Nous, les 23 085 francophones de l'ACFO de l'Estrie dans l'Est ontarien plus spécifiquement des comtés de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry, voulons vous décrire notre réalité.

Nous sommes à la porte du Québec, cette belle province qui manifeste de plus en plus le désir de se démarquer du Canada anglais. Nous, francophones en Ontario, comprenons bien l'état d'âme québécois. Nous savons ce que représente être minoritaire dans son pays. Nous connaissons les enjeux des négociations de tels rapports. Nous connaissons le prix à payer avant d'obtenir accès à nos droits légitimes.

L'assimilation effarante de nos francophones est le prix à payer. Peut-on continuer à se laisser disparaître sans rien dire ? C'est le prix à payer à cause des lenteurs et des lourdeurs des gouvernements successifs depuis 200 ans.

Des moyens, entre autres, pour nous permettre de survivre en Ontario sont : éliminer toutes mesures discriminatoires envers les francophones que l'on retrouve dans les lois actuelles ; accorder prestation égale et simultanée de services en français : ne plus attendre que les citoyens citoyens de l'Ontario français revendiquent à grands coûts des poursuites judiciaires ou du temps, de l'énergie et de l'argent dépensés pour vous entendre dire que nos droits doivent être respectés.

Que ce temps, énergie et argent soient investis pour que les francophones puissent « Vivre décemment » en Ontario. Vivre décemment veut dire entre autres pleine gestion de nos institutions d'éducation de la maternelle à l'université.

ec financement juste et équitable : conseil scolaire de langue française avec financement garanti ; collèges francophones avec financement adéquat ; pleine gestion de nos institutions de santé ; pleine gestion de nos institutions de services sociaux et communautaires.

Vous me direz qu'il existe différents programmes pour conventionner différents services pour les francophones en Ontario. Oui, je vous l'accorde. Mais quand nous, francophones en Ontario, réussissons à nous pointer le nez sur l'échiquier de ces programmes, nous entrons dans le processus d'élimination du projet. La lente et lourde quinquennaire administrative retarde l'approbation des projets humains.

Comme exemple, on soumet un projet à l'agent du projet. Il y a accusé de réception et évaluation du projet, toujours des attentes ; le dépôt sur le bureau du conseil régional ; le retour à la case 1 pour modifications, encore des attentes. Il y a des modifications à être apportées ; la submission doit être portée au superviseur régional. Encore, il y a des délais. D'autres modifications sont recommandées ; le programme est envoyé à Toronto pour être évalué par le gérant de programmes. Il y a encore des attentes, des délais puisque le programme doit être soumis au directeur des programmes. Ensuite, il est soumis au sous-ministre et au ministre pour l'approbation finale.

Ce sont les étapes à parcourir avant l'approbation et cela continue après l'approbation ministérielle. Comme exemple, en novembre 1989 le Centre de santé de l'Estrie recevait une approbation ministérielle pour implanter de nouveaux services de santé en français dans la région.

Aujourd'hui, le 26 février 1991, les francophones n'ont toujours pas accès à ces services. La cause : la lenteur et la lourdeur administratives aux différents échelons du processus d'implantation.

Pendant ce temps, nos francophones sont privés des services auxquels ils ont droit. Ils s'habituent à demander en anglais. Même, ils se dispensent de certains services sachant très bien qu'ils ne recevront aucune satisfaction. C'est pourquoi nous demandons une réforme au niveau ministériel des programmes et de développement dans différents ministères. Nous demandons aussi une réforme sociale pour financer ces services qui devront être de qualité.

En tant que recommandation : comme résidents de l'Ontario et citoyens du Canada, nous voulons que l'Ontario hausse au niveau de sa constitution les articles 16 à 20 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés. Merci.

140

M. Rancourt : Mon nom est Jean-Yves Rancourt. Je suis président du comité des citoyens de la Cité collégiale à campus de Cornwall.

Tout d'abord, nous vous remercions de nous avoir donné l'occasion de présenter nos idées devant votre comité.

Nous sommes ici aujourd'hui au nom des membres du comité des citoyens de la Cité collégiale, campus de Cornwall, un comité qui représente, depuis le début du mouvement de la Cité collégiale, les intérêts auprès des francophones, jeunes et adultes qui veulent étudier au niveau collégial en français.

Il est important de signaler le rôle que la Cité collégiale joue auprès de la collectivité francophone et ontarienne. La Cité collégiale offre des cours et des programmes qui sont rattachés de très près à la réalité du marché du travail dans l'est de l'Ontario. Les étudiants et étudiantes, les apprenants et apprenantes qui s'inscrivent à la Cité apportent avec eux leurs bagages, leurs connaissances et leurs réalités. Souvent, ces réalités reflètent un peuple qui a longtemps été laissé dans le brouillard de la société majoritaire. En effet, mesdames et messieurs, il existe un immense rattrapage à faire. Nous croyons que, avec l'appui du gouvernement provincial, dans sa vision d'un avenir juste et équitable le gouvernement posera audacieusement les gestes qui compteront à l'épanouissement des institutions postsecondaires francophones et dans ce cas-ci, la Cité collégiale. Quels gestes ? Ce sont ceux de reconnaître davantage et de mettre en application les uniques recommandations fondamentales que la communauté francophone réclame avec toute l'énergie des centaines de milliers de personnes qu'elle constitue.

La Cité collégiale, premier collège d'arts appliqués et de technologie de langue française de l'Ontario, a en outre les responsabilités d'ordre général qui s'attachent à ce genre d'institution, compétence exclusive pour dispenser des programmes et des services en langue française au niveau collégial. La direction de la Cité collégiale entend faire de celle-ci un lieu d'excellence en formation et en perfectionnement professionnel et privilégier l'épanouissement personnel. Elle entend aussi, en consultation avec des représentants d'autres organismes publics ou privés ainsi que de la population, mettre la Cité collégiale au service de la promotion économique, sociale et culturelle de la collectivité franco-ontarienne.

Dans sa première année opérationnelle, la Cité collégiale a largement dépassé ses objectifs de 2300 étudiants et étudiantes à temps plein inscrits aux 80 différents programmes sur trois campus situés à Hawkesbury, Cornwall et Ottawa. La Cité collégiale regroupe déjà une quarantaine de comités consultatifs formés de représentants et de représentantes de tous les secteurs imaginables : les services de la santé, les métiers, les secteurs publics et parapublics, industriels et commerciaux.

Baucoup d'attention est portée sur le développement de la communauté. Le fait que la Cité vient de naître démontre une occasion extraordinaire de travailler mains en mains avec le gouvernement et ses ministères à la promotion économique, sociale et culturelle de la collectivité franco-ontarienne.

En faisant partie du réseau provincial des collèges d'arts appliqués et de technique et en ayant l'appui incontestable du gouvernement provincial, la Cité collégiale voit l'importance de faire avancer son mandat par cinq objectifs :

La Cité collégiale exerce son mandat exclusif et met tout en oeuvre pour répondre de façon proactive aux aspirations des personnes et des collectivités qui souhaitent une formation de qualité en langue française.

La Cité collégiale assure à la collectivité de l'est de l'Ontario des programmes et des services pertinents de qualité et d'application souple.

La Cité collégiale participe au développement économique de la collectivité francophone de l'est de l'Ontario.

La Cité collégiale promouvait la connaissance du français et l'épanouissement de la culture franco-ontarienne en créant un milieu propice au développement dans la collectivité franco-ontarienne du sens de l'appartenance et de la fierté.

La Cité collégiale se dote d'une culture et d'une structure organisationnelles qui favorisent l'initiative interne et la participation de l'extérieur afin de répondre efficacement aux besoins des divers éléments des communautés locales et régionales de l'est de l'Ontario.

Pour réaliser ces cinq objectifs fondamentaux, le gouvernement ontarien doit continuer à démontrer un leadership auprès de la francophonie dans le domaine postsecondaire.

Nous croyons que la clé au développement global des communautés dispensées à travers toute la province est la ressource humaine. Il faut combattre l'analphabétisme, l'assimilation et le décrochage de nos ressources humaines et promouvoir le professionnalisme, l'éducation dans les métiers, la préparation à l'emploi sur le marché du travail et le sens d'appartenance de nos ressources humaines.

L'importance de pouvoir étudier au collège en français est primordial et l'Ontario se doit d'être un chef de file et doit persister à faire grandir la francophonie, non seulement en Ontario mais dans tout le Canada et par tous les moyens possibles.

Voici les recommandations du Comité des citoyens de la Cité collégiale : que le gouvernement de l'Ontario continue à appuyer l'éducation francophone postsecondaire collégiale à travers la province en réaffermissant ses lois concernant l'éducation francophone et en appuyant l'établissement d'un site permanent de la Cité collégiale à Cornwall ; que le gouvernement de l'Ontario devienne un chef de file pour promouvoir l'égalité linguistique et culturelle dans la province. Merci.

The Chair: I will just remind people here who may have come in late or people following us over the parliamentary network that we are in the process of hearing from a coalition of francophone organizations that have come together to make a joint presentation. People may be wondering why the time has been extended in this way. There are six different organizations that are presenting in front of us today.

M. Duplantie : Mon nom est Roger Duplantie, membre du Comité provisoire de l'Agence de développement économique Proaction.

Les gens d'affaires des trois comtés unis de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry vous remercient de l'occasion que vous leur donnez d'être entendus devant votre comité.

Notre présentation tentera d'attirer votre attention sur l'importance des francophones dans le domaine des affaires ; ce qu'ils apportent et donnent et retournent à la communauté et l'importance d'une province forte dans un Canada uni et fort.

L'Agence de développement économique Proaction s'est donné pour mission la promotion et le développement économique de la communauté franco-ontarienne de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry. Pour ce faire, elle stimule

l'entrepreneuriat et favorise avec et pour le compte de francophones la création d'emplois, de modalités de soutien au monde des affaires, de modes de communication entre les diverses composantes d'expression française et de milieux de travail où la langue des communications internes est normalement le français.

En outre, elle veille au perfectionnement des intérêts et à la collaboration entre les intervenants communautaires des secteurs économique, éducatif, social, culturel — des loisirs et de communications notamment — en leur qualité de partenaires dans la promotion et le développement économique de la communauté franco-ontarienne.

Bien qu'elle en soit à ses premiers pas, l'Agence de développement économique Proaction regroupe déjà quelque 300 membres et se tient à l'affût d'événements qui pourront s'avérer bénéfiques pour la communauté économique.

Toutefois, pour bien assurer la promotion et le développement économique de la communauté franco-ontarienne l'Ontario se doit d'être un chef de file dans la promotion du français en Ontario et au Canada. Par sa politique linguistique, et plus particulièrement avec la Loi 8, elle permet des communautés comme Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry de s'épanouir davantage. Cependant, il ne faudrait pas s'arrêter là. La province doit continuer à jouer son rôle de leadership en ce qui a trait aux langues officielles du pays.

Le fait que l'est ontarien a été désigné pour recevoir des services gouvernementaux bilingues favorise la venue d'industries provenant du Québec et d'ailleurs qui sont à la recherche d'une main-d'œuvre bilingue. Toutefois, elle recherche également une culture et un mode de vie en français.

Nous sommes à même de vous affirmer connaître des industries, comme Canadian Tours et Granby Metal Starping, qui se sont établies à Cornwall parce qu'elles pouvaient y retrouver une main-d'œuvre bilingue et un mode de vie en français. D'ailleurs, la ville de Cornwall en fait promotion dans ses dépliants visant à attirer des industries dans son parc industriel.

1150

La province peut également jouer un rôle important pour améliorer la qualité de vie dans SDG. Depuis temps qu'elle en parle, il serait plus que temps que la province décentralise ses bureaux gouvernementaux. En effet, après Kingston on retrouve l'est ontarien et en particulier les comtés de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry, une région désignée bilingue. Ces ministères seraient à même de trouver du personnel bilingue et ces emplois, en plus de donner du travail à une population qui possède un des plus hauts taux de chômage dans la province, augmenteraient la qualité de vie, ce qui favoriserait encore davantage l'établissement d'industries dans la région. Plus notre région gagnera, plus la province en retirera des profits et plus l'Ontario fera belle figure aux niveaux national et international d'autant plus que nous sommes situés près des frontières américaines.

Par ailleurs, étant à proximité de la province de Québec, les comtés de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry représentent une région propice au développement économique. Et ce n'est pas seulement avec des industries qu'une communauté grandit mais avec des services gouvernementaux

de tous genres, des institutions solides et un bon système d'éducation.

Parlant d'éducation et d'institutions, la venue de la Cité collégiale dans la région est grandement appréciée par les gens d'affaires. En effet, grâce à ce collège communautaire, les gens d'affaires pourront éventuellement compter sur des diplômés qualifiés pouvant répondre à leurs exigences. D'ailleurs, plusieurs hommes et femmes d'affaires sont impliqués dans les divers comités consultatifs de la cité afin de s'assurer que la formation que les futurs diplômés recevront sera adéquate en tout temps.

Par ailleurs, le campus de Cornwall de l'Université d'Ottawa vient tout juste de présenter au recteur de l'Université d'Ottawa un projet pour l'implantation d'un institut des sciences de l'environnement du Saint-Laurent.

Situé aux abords du fleuve Saint-Laurent, cet institut serait unique au pays et les occasions d'affaires seraient incalculables pour la communauté tout en y attirant des étudiants de partout au pays. La province serait alors une des premières à y retrouver un gain appréciable au niveau canadien grâce à l'originalité du projet, alors que de plus en plus, la population canadienne et même mondiale s'intéresse et s'inquiète de son environnement.

Comme vous pouvez le constater, la communauté francophone de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry se prend en main économiquement et elle exige que le gouvernement de l'Ontario raffermisse sa politique de bilinguisme dans la province et continue d'exercer son leadership au niveau des deux langues officielles du Canada, pour un Canada ni d'un océan à l'autre.

Par conséquent, voici les recommandations de notre groupe : que le gouvernement de l'Ontario procède dès maintenant à la décentralisation de ses bureaux vers des régions désignées bilingues, entre autres, la région de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry ; et que le gouvernement de l'Ontario raffermisse sa Loi sur les services en français dans les régions désignées bilingues et qu'il intensifie la promotion de ces régions aux niveaux provincial, national et international. Merci.

Mme Gauthier : Bonjour. Je suis Monique Gauthier, coordonnatrice du Centre polyvalent des aînés francophones de Cornwall.

Aujourd'hui, dans ce mémoire, il sera question de l'importance du Centre polyvalent des aînés francophones, de son impact dans notre communauté comouaillienne francophone et enfin, de l'économie qui profitera à notre gouvernement ontarien et de l'exemple de services dont les autres provinces pourront bénéficier.

Notre organisme est un organisme à but non lucratif cherchant à desservir une population cible de plus de 5000 francophones aînés de Cornwall. Notre centre appartiendra aux gens du troisième âge. Ces derniers pourront profiter d'un éventail de services socioculturels et de maintien de l'autonomie. Ces services seront offerts prochainement selon les besoins et les suggestions de nos aînés.

En effectuant dernièrement une enquête auprès des clubs d'âge d'or de Cornwall, nous avons voulu nous sensibiliser aux services qui existent déjà pour les aînés francophones de notre communauté. Il en ressort que les activités sociales et culturelles offertes en français sont les jeux de

cartes, un ou deux soupers communautaires à chaque mois et à ceux dont la condition physique le permet jouer aux quilles.

Ces activités à ce moment-là ne permettent pas à cette population cible de s'épanouir, de conserver et de développer leur autonomie. C'est l'objectif que nous poursuivons en ouvrant notre centre polyvalent de jour pour les aînés francophones de Cornwall.

Nous avons donc besoin de subventions — excusez-moi de le demander — pour la mise sur pied des programmes d'ordre socioculturels, le maintien de l'autonomie et de garde de jour.

Nos aînés, payeurs de taxes, sont en droit de se voir offrir les mêmes services existants du côté anglophone. Ainsi, ils pourront continuer à oeuvrer dans notre communauté et le gouvernement économisera de l'argent sur les soins hospitaliers et les maisons d'assistance. La communauté pourra donc s'enorgueillir de voir ces personnes continuer à être actives et profitera par le fait même de l'expérience de nos aînés.

Maintenant, passons au côté moins comique de l'histoire, les statistiques. C'est de temps en temps assez ennuyant. Lors du dernier recensement de 1986 de Statistique Canada, la population francophone — français total — de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry âgée de 55 ans et plus serait de 7125. Il n'est donc pas erroné d'avancer le chiffre de 5000 aînés francophones vivant à Cornwall. Notre centre vise à proposer des services en français à ce groupe cible. Des études faites par différents organismes gouvernementaux démontrent l'importance d'offrir des services de soutien et de soin aux aînés. On s'attend, selon ces études, à ce que le nombre de personnes âgées double au cours des 30 prochaines années, dont moi aussi je ferai partie à ce moment-là. L'espérance de vie augmente pour tout le monde, c'est pourquoi il faut se préparer et offrir des services à nos aînés francophones.

En retournant dans l'histoire, les Canadiens français auraient immigré à Cornwall vers 1786, attirés par les industries et la construction du canal. Selon Marc Bisonnette, «En 1881, ils étaient aussi nombreux que les anglophones». À ce moment-là, comme référence il donne le recensement de 1881 qui indique qu'ils étaient 2222 sur une population de 4468 à Cornwall. «Un siècle plus tard, en 1971, Cornwall est devenu une grande ville et compte 47 120 habitants dont 23 320 sont d'origine française».

Ces statistiques paraissent excellentes, mais en fait représentent l'origine ethnique. Le tableau pourtant est fort différent de la réalité lorsqu'on veut parler de langue maternelle encore comprise ou de langue d'usage. «En 1961, seulement 42%, au lieu de 54%, et en 1971 moins de 30% au lieu de 50% des citoyens se considéraient de langue maternelle française, ce qui témoignerait alors d'une assimilation incroyablement de 22% à 23% de nos francophones d'origine».

1200

Que s'est-il passé ? Et que se passe-t-il encore présentement en 1991 ? Nous voulons rétablir l'équilibre. Nous voulons notre place aujourd'hui pour hier et demain.

Nous constatons qu'ici même à Cornwall, certains de nos aînés ne parlent ni ne comprennent l'anglais. C'est

pourquoi notre étude nous démontre la nécessité d'ouvrir un centre polyvalent pour nos aînés francophones.

Nous remercions la commission de s'être déplacée ici à Cornwall pour entendre notre point de vue sur la direction que devrait prendre l'Ontario dans le Canada de demain. Nous espérons vous avoir sensibilisés à la problématique de nos grands oubliés.

Comme recommandations : au niveau socioéconomique que nos aînés francophones reçoivent des services dans leur langue. Ici je paraphrase une citation de Kay Spicer, article paru dans le *Ottawa Citizen* : « Tout individu a le droit de vivre, de vieillir et de mourir dans sa langue » ;

deuxième recommandation ; que l'Ontario enchâsse dans sa constitution les articles 16, 18, 19, 20 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés. Il donnerait ainsi aux francophones de l'Ontario le statut de citoyens à part entière. C'est la direction que l'Ontario devrait prendre dans le Canada de demain. Merci beaucoup.

Mme Blais : Je suis Suzanne Blais. Je représente le comité de citoyennes et citoyens du Conseil scolaire de langue française pour Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry.

Nous vous remercions, les membres du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario dans la Confédération d'avoir fait un arrêt à Cornwall afin d'entendre l'opinion des citoyens et citoyennes face à l'avenir de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

Le comité des citoyens regroupe près de 100 membres dans les comtés de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry. Ces citoyens et citoyennes travaillent avec acharnement depuis 1985 pour l'obtention d'un conseil scolaire de langue française qui rassemblerait tous les francophones de nos trois comtés. D'une étape à l'autre, d'obstacles à embûches, nous persistons dans cette optique.

Avec l'aide d'un comité local, Proaction, nous avons pu obtenir les services d'un contractuel pour défricher les bases d'une structure d'un conseil scolaire de langue française. Cette structure tenait compte des expériences dans la province tel que l'on connaît à Toronto, à Ottawa-Carleton et à Penetanguishene. Le document fut finalisé en janvier 1990 et un exemplaire fut déposé sur le bureau du ministre de l'Éducation dans les mois qui suivirent.

Les deux sections françaises des conseils scolaires de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry décident de former un comité d'étude pour travailler à un modèle d'un conseil scolaire de langue française. La présidente de notre comité de citoyen, Nicole Bourgeois, est invitée à siéger au sein de ce comité d'étude pour apporter naturellement le fruit de nos labeurs, c'est-à-dire notre document et nos recommandations. On y ajoute une étude financière. D'ailleurs, ce dernier rapport n'est pas encore rendu public.

L'avènement d'un conseil scolaire de langue française pour la région de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry est une question de droit et non de privilège. La création d'un conseil scolaire de langue française s'appuie sur les principes directeurs dont je vais vous en citer quelques-uns :

1. un engagement à garder unis les francophones, indépendamment de leur croyance ainsi que de leurs effectifs ;
2. un droit à un financement équitable pour offrir une qualité d'éducation équivalente à celle offerte à la majorité de la langue officielle ;

3. une gestion complète et totale par et pour les francophones de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry, condition essentielle à l'amélioration de la qualité de l'éducation dans les écoles de langue française ;

4. l'accès à l'éducation confessionnelle et non confessionnelle conformément à la Loi sur l'éducation et à la Charte des droits et libertés et à la Loi sur l'éducation ;

5. une modification, si nécessaire, aux limites territoriales actuelles pour mieux répondre aux besoins de la minorité de la langue officielle telle que définie par le gouvernement fédéral. Je passe sous silence les deux autres.

Nous estimons que les francophones des comtés ont droit, en vertu de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, à un conseil scolaire de langue française. Depuis 1982, l'article 23 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés accorde aux citoyens canadiens du groupe linguistique minoritaire le droit de faire instruire leurs enfants dans les établissements d'enseignement de la minorité linguistique financés par les fonds publics. En mars 1990, la Cour suprême du Canada a statué dans l'affaire Mahé que l'article 23 de la Charte confère aux parents appartenant à la minorité linguistique un droit de gestion et de contrôle, l'égard des établissements d'enseignement où leurs enfants sont instruits. Cette gestion et ce contrôle, disait le tribunal, sont vitaux pour assurer l'épanouissement de leur langue et de leur culture.

Le degré de gestion et de contrôle exigé par l'article 23 peut, si le nombre d'élèves le justifie, aller jusqu'à un conseil scolaire autonome. La population francophone des comtés de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry est importante. Un conseil scolaire de langue française aurait au-delà de 6000 élèves. Il est donc clair que le conseil scolaire de langue française de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry sera éminemment justifiable au point de vue pédagogique et financier.

Une seule recommandation à vous présenter : que l'Ontario assume un rôle de leadership au sein de la gestion scolaire autonome des minorités officielles au Canada. Je vous remercie et je repasse la parole à Étienne St-Aubin.

M. St-Aubin : En terminant donc, je pense qu'il est important de dire deux choses. Nous sommes bien conscients que le visage de l'Ontario a beaucoup changé depuis quelques années et continue de changer du côté de sa diversité multiculturelle. Il n'y a aucune contradiction entre cette richesse-là et l'appréciation de cette richesse et la reconnaissance des droits des francophones. Au contraire, vraiment au contraire, le vrai respect des minorités ethniques de notre province commence d'abord par la reconnaissance des droits historiques du peuple francophone, un peuple qui comprend dans sa famille une diversité culturelle en elle-même.

Nous accueillons dans la communauté francophone de peuples de divers pays qui adoptent le français comme leur langue officielle. Je pense donc qu'il ne faudrait jamais croire que les soumissions que vous avez entendues aujourd'hui ne sont faites que dans un intérêt étroit. Elles sont présentées dans un intérêt, justement, de filles et fils et cette province-ci qui sont fiers de l'être et heureux de vous avoir accueillis à Cornwall. Merci beaucoup.

The Chair: We have some time left in the presentation for questions, if there are any, from the members, either to any of the individuals or collectively and then they can decide.

Mr Harnick: You made mention of your involvement with Bill 8, and as we have travelled about, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about that bill and about the implementation of that bill. One of the arguments—and I do not know whether it is a perception or whether it is real, but we heard it again this morning—is that people who are not bilingual, because of Bill 8 or bills like Bill 8, are not able to compete for jobs.

Is there any way that Bill 8 can be implemented in such a way that it could satisfy the needs of the Franco-Ontarian communities and at the same time not be perceived as being something affecting people's competitiveness for jobs if they are not bilingual?

110

Mr St-Aubin: If I may answer directly in English, first of all, the legislation addresses the specific needs of this province and it was built upon the notion of offering services in an effective way, and that is why the calculations made of the numbers involved here of positions that were required to be staffed by personnel who could offer services in both languages were assessed as being relatively small. In fact, the figure is somewhere between 5% and 10%.

I was not involved in the implementation of the act and know that certainly issues of sensitivity sometimes overshadow what might be written in legislation. Also, I think it has been acknowledged that regrettably there may have been much too late an effort to explain what this legislation was in the belief that the voices of acrimony and hatred could be ignored. Unfortunately, those voices were not to be ignored too long and untruths became beliefs in people's minds.

This legislation precisely does not take up section 16 of the Charter, and as you will recall in my submissions, that is not a section that I would urge upon you. This legislation, in its intent and, I believe, in the way the implementation was intended, was that of effective offer of services in designated areas.

Mr Harnick: Can I just follow up for one moment? I want to agree with you about your comments dealing with the implementation of the bill. Is there something that the provincial government could be and should be doing now to alleviate the problems that you have pointed out?

Mr Robert: Okay, I will answer in English too. If there are any problems, then I will go back to French.

First of all, Bill 8 was poorly sold by the government during its implementation. It is important to underline that the language of administration within the government is English and only a small proportion of the positions are designated as bilingual and most of these positions are front-line workers. So perhaps if the government would sell a better understanding of Bill 8 and the real implications, other than, you know, false understanding that in people's minds became the truth, that became reality.

Mr Harnick: Thank you very much.

M. Beer : Merci pour tous les renseignements que vous nous avez donnés, une gamme de renseignements et de projets de la communauté francophone de cette région.

J'aimerais juste poser une question au sujet du conseil scolaire, là où cette question est rendue aujourd'hui. Si je comprends bien, dans cette région les deux communautés, c'est-à-dire la communauté catholique et les parents qui envoient leurs enfants dans les écoles publiques, sont d'accord pour la formation d'un conseil scolaire peut-être un peu comme à Ottawa-Carleton, une sorte de conseil homogène. Est-ce qu'on a aussi discuté de la possibilité d'unir un conseil régional Prescott-Russell-SDG ou est-ce qu'on pense qu'il faut avoir un conseil pour cette région-là et un autre conseil pour SDG ? Est-ce qu'il y a eu des discussions et est-ce que j'ai bien compris qu'on parle d'un seul conseil francophone et non pas de deux pour SDG ?

Mme Blais : Oui, effectivement on parle d'un conseil scolaire de langue française pour SDG, c'est ce qu'on veut ; il y a une population qui le demande et aussi mille enfants francophones ici dans ces trois comtés. La question pour Prescott et Russell a été soulevée mais n'a pas été approfondie. Nous continuons à chercher puis à faire des recommandations bien structurées pour un conseil scolaire de langue française dans SDG.

M. Winninger : Nous avons écouté plusieurs groupes multiculturels qui veulent avoir les mêmes droits, les mêmes services que vous. Est-ce que vous croyez qu'on peut distinguer entre les droits des francophones des autres groupes multiculturels ?

M. St-Aubin : Si vous permettez, il y a certainement, premièrement, certains services linguistiques qui doivent être offerts dans autant de langues que possible. On parle par exemple d'interprétation au niveau de tribunaux, on parle d'accès à certains services cruciaux au niveau, par exemple, de la Commission des accidents du travail et autres. Mais je pense qu'il est injuste pour justifier l'abandon ou la négligence de l'aspect linguistique des droits des francophones, de vouloir invoquer le besoin d'offrir le même niveau de droits linguistiques à tous les peuples qui se sont incorporés à la communauté linguistique de l'Ontario.

Premièrement, la devise de l'Ontario suggère jusqu'à un certain point ce dont je parle : «*Ut inceptis fidelis sic permanet*», je pense qu'il est important de demeurer fidèle à ses origines pour qu'on soit fidèle à son avenir. Les peuples qui se sont associés à cette famille ontarienne, comme je vous l'ai indiqué, s'incorporent évidemment à la communauté anglophone mais aussi à la communauté francophone. La communauté francophone est accueillante aussi pour les peuples de tous les pays. Je peux vous dire qu'ici même à Cornwall, le groupe qui s'est présenté auparavant ne parle pas nécessairement au nom de toutes les ethnies de cette région. Plusieurs de ces ethnies sont représentées dans la communauté francophone de cette région. Ce que j'entends d'eux, c'est une phrase que nous nous sommes laissé dire, que la tolérance qui doit caractériser notre pays est mieux inspirée par le respect des droits linguistiques et le maintien des droits linguistiques des francophones, que c'est leur meilleure garantie. L'abandon de ces

droits, le recul serait une menace pour tous les groupes linguistiques minoritaires.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation. Not that we have not heard a great many representations dealing with the rights of Franco-Ontarians, but it is a great opportunity for the committee to have representatives from different organizations before us at once. My question deals with the issues which you have brought forward, which are talking about making certain that there are certain services, Franco-Ontarian services, which are not only protected but indeed advanced. Whether they be in education or senior citizens or whatever, there is the need for not only the protection but the advancement of those particular services.

1220

There is, aside from those very important issues which you have brought forward, the question of the activities going on in Quebec today, what they are doing and what they are looking at and how they are dealing with their particular issues. Is any message given to Quebec, in your opinion, on the basis of how this province deals with Franco-Ontarian rights? I am looking for what the message is to Quebec or if there is a message to Quebec as a result of how the province of Ontario deals with the hopes and aspirations of Franco-Ontarians.

Mr St-Aubin: If I may, the message is not getting through as to the very positive steps that have been taken by successive governments of the province of Ontario. It is not getting through. Efforts have been made in perhaps a haphazard way to convey that, but one is up against the—and I do not think it is collusion on the part of the Quebec media. I think it is a simple tendency of media to portray the negative, although there may be a dash of collusion too. But there is certainly the fact that the positive stances taken by successive governments of this province are not getting through, and I recognize that that may be frustrating for you as legislators.

I think, however, that the issue of what Ontario does is important. Ontario counts quite a lot for Quebec. One reads it in the media every day. Anything that is done there is usually—and politicians, in speaking of roads or whatever, would always compare to Ontario. Ontario is the rest of Canada as far as Quebec is concerned in its media, and what Ontario does counts.

I have no ready-made solution as to how one conveys the right message. I think, though, that it is important that the leaders of this province recognize that it is now a question of dignity and feelings, as I tried to convey at the outset. We can talk about laws and structures and so forth, but really it is a question now of how people feel about how they are wanted or not in this country. The feeling in Quebec now, and understandably so after the Meech Lake fiasco, is one of deep insult, and quite correctly so, because it was an insult in terms of the way it eventually came to an end.

But if Ontario wishes to convey its message, I think its leadership will have to take original steps and perhaps go directly to the people there because every single time that I have spoken of the positive steps that have been taken

here, there is appreciation and there is change of mind. So I think that it is important that specific steps be taken by the province to do that. Enshrining certain aspects in the Constitution, as I have indicated, will undoubtedly have great impact. If the negative can have such an impact there are means, surely, that the positive can too.

The Chair: With that, we will end this presentation and thank you very much. Merci pour votre présentation.

RICHARD HICKERSON

The Chair: Could I call next Richard Hickerson. Good evening, sir.

Mr Hickerson: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and thank you to all the members of your committee who have been kind enough to receive me this morning. Unlike the group which have preceded me, I speak only on my own behalf.

I would like to start, with your permission, with a very short little anecdote from my past. I am 61 years old. In 1946, I turned 16. The war was just over, Canadians were prouder than ever that they had vanquished the forces of evil in Europe, but we still were not Canadian citizens because the Canadian Citizenship Act had not yet been passed by the Parliament of Canada. So here we were British subjects—proud of it, mind you, not to take anything away from that, but we still could not say with a straight face and a period after the sentence that we were Canadian.

I was only 16 at the time and that struck me as strange that my father at the post office, when I went to be registered, could not tell the clerk that his father was from Ontario and that his father before him was from Ontario. That was not an adequate reply. They wanted to know your country of national origin. In other words, they wanted to hyphenate you as a Canadian. They wanted to truncate you and make you less. That has never left me, the idea that for the first time in my life in 1946, when the Parliament of Canada passed the Canadian Citizenship Act, I could say "I am a Canadian," period. Regardless of whether I was aboriginal or French or Greek or Icelandic or German or Scandinavian or Yugoslav or whatever, I was a Canadian and I was proud of it.

So I thank you again for having me today. I know you have a lot of people to hear and I will try to make my remarks as brief as I can. I have a tendency to be a bit long-winded and I have been warned that I will be cut off if I do so, so I will stick to my text as much as I can. I have provided you copies of my text. This is a summary.

Canada's history is intimately linked to its geography and you cannot understand Canada unless you understand its geography, but it is a big enough place to receive people of all creeds and races if we can be big enough to allow this to happen, if we can learn to grow together in mutual respect and co-operation.

Canada is also a relatively new experiment in human living. It is a country where hatred should be slowly dying, a country where hatred and racism ought to be dying instead of getting more virulent, where true brotherhood must be born under the fatherhood of God. That is the kind of Canada I have the vision of.

Interestingly enough, if you look at the BNA, no province was ever given the right to secede from Canada. This really was meant to stay together for ever. None of the fathers ever foresaw that any one of the children would decide to secede from the family. This is just not conceivable. It is not in the Canadian way of thinking and it was not in the way of thinking of the fathers of this country. Canada was meant to last for ever.

Canada really has not failed. Like many things, it just really has not been fully tried yet. It is in crisis, though, and we can no longer take Canada for granted. We must start really caring for this wonderful country or risk the dreadful, horrible possibility that it might slip through our hands.

Again these are personal opinions, but it seems to me that in Canada we have to have a strong federal government. Canada is such a big place, such a diverse place, such a huge country. We cannot erode the powers of the federal government to the point where the federal government can no longer speak or no longer does speak on behalf of Canadians. Unfortunately that is why we are in the mess we are in today. Our central voice is no longer the strong voice that it used to be, and that weakens the whole of Canada.

230

In my view, the federal government must be able to speak univocally for all of Canada, all Canadians. If we are in the crisis we are in today, it is precisely because the power of the federal government to speak for Canada has been so dangerously weakened. I have to say this here, gentlemen, and I do not mean it in any personal way, but the provinces must stop being so greedy for power. The reason why they have to stop doing that is that every time they get more power, the central government ends up with less and Canada becomes less strong, less able to speak with the united voice.

We can understand, humanly speaking, that provinces want more power. Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, we are all the same. But for the sake of the common good of the whole country, the provinces must curb their insatiable appetite for more and more and more power. Canada cannot withstand that appetite. You are going to eat us to death if you keep pushing that hard. This goes for all provinces, not just Ontario and not just Quebec, but all provinces in Canada from the smallest to the most powerful.

It is absolutely essential, in my view, that all Canadians be treated equally. I know that is a dream and an ideal but it is worth striving for. We must make sure that native Canadians are treated fairly and with equity and that no Canadian ever feels he is second-rate or third-rate or fourth-rate. Every Canadian should be able to feel that he is a first-rate Canadian.

But having said that, no Canadian is more distinct than any other Canadian. We have got to get this crazy word "distinctness" out of our vocabulary. It is nonsense. It is not logical, it is not philosophically correct and if you push that too far, you are going to have 26 million different countries in Canada instead of one country. You cannot push that that far. It is absurd to do so.

Canadians also have to get to know each other better. Gosh, we know each other very poorly. The provincial government and the federal government have to develop more programs and more plans to help Canadians to get to know each other better. We have got to encourage more travel. This country is so big, most Canadians cannot afford to travel to other parts of Canada. It is too costly. So what we have to do, and the Ontario government could maybe take the lead in this area, is say, "Hey, let's help Canadians to travel more in Canada so that Quebecers can get to know us better, so that we can get to know them better and understand them better."

No province should ever be allowed to blackmail the rest of Canada by threatening to leave the Canadian family. Each cultural and linguistic group may and must and should defend and promote its wellbeing in a multicultural Canada but never at the expense of anyone else. That is the key right there.

The other point I would like to make, and I know Bob Rae's government is strong on this point and I support that wholeheartedly, is that the wealthy in Canada must bear a more reasonable share of the tax burden in this country. It is time to say to the really wealthy in Canada who have become wealthy because of Canada, "Okay, fair share." Because the basis of taxation has always been the ability to pay, the wealthy must pay a fair share so that the burden is taken away from middle-income and low-income Canadians.

The other thing that annoys me no end in Canada is how language has been used often as a weapon both in French Canada and in English Canada. How are you going to eliminate racism and hatred in Canada when you promote it? When you use language and culture as a weapon against each other, how can you do that? How can you have a united Canada?

The other bit of nonsense that has been perpetrated on us by people who perhaps thought they were doing the right thing is the whole business of an officially bilingual Canada. Canada need not be officially bilingual in order to be a united country. By saying that, I am not saying that it is not okay for Canada to be multicultural and multilingual, but it is not necessary. Unfortunately bilingualism has divided us against one another.

The Chair: You are going to have to sum up very, very briefly.

Mr Hickerson: Okay. On a small planet like Earth there simply is no room for narrow nationalism, regionalism or tribalism. But the one positive thing I see coming out of this is that, out of our despair for Canada, maybe we are starting to really care about Canada. I think that is fantastic because, if out of this despair for Canada can come hope that we can make Canada work—the way I see it, if Canada can be made to work, then the world can work, but if Canada cannot be made to work, neither can the world be made to work. It will continue to fail. Canada is not an easy experiment, but it is very well worth the effort. We could become, if we wanted to, a model for a better, more humane and civilized world, and we owe it to ourselves and the future to give the Canadian experiment our very best shot.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. We are going to move on to the next presenter.

SHIRLEY ARMSTRONG

The Chair: I call Shirley Armstrong. While Mrs Armstrong is coming to the table, we have on the list also Étienne St-Aubin, but I believe he was one of the people who presented earlier.

Interjection.

The Chair: A different presentation? We will come back to him after this then.

Mrs Armstrong: I am not in a hurry.

The Chair: No, go ahead, ma'am.

Mrs Armstrong: Ladies and gentlemen, I did not realize this was going to be so formal and a lot of pomp and ceremony, so I do not have a presentation to give you that is all typed out. I am going into the point system because I have noticed that we are running out of time and I have a buddy back there who has one all typed up, so he may do a lot better.

I would like to say that I do not think that taking all these powers away from the federal government, as the Allaire report is looking for, and holding a gun to the rest of Canada's head to make people go along with it is good for our country. I think that the federal government should have quite a few powers. They should have control over the environment, for one thing, so a company cannot say, "Ontario won't let us do this, so we'll go to another province and that way we can pollute." I am on a public liaison committee here in town, which is what brought that one to mind.

On the unity of Canada, I think the biggest problem is lack of communication and dialogue. I was of the opinion that this was going to be rather an informal committee where we could discuss things with people, instead of these presentation-style things. But I do believe that what we do need are discussions, not me and half a dozen other people sitting here giving our opinion without somebody being able to refute it and question us and find out where we are really coming from.

What we need is the voice of the people, not the voice of the politicians—I am sorry if that is going to insult all you people here—and we do not need as much media coverage. Politicians and media have a way, you have got to admit, of twisting things around. I suppose one of them is to get votes and the other one is to get ratings. I do not know why they do it, but I have certainly noticed it. I think it would be much better to have groups of people that could discuss, argue, holler at each other, whatever, get it all out in the open, and then if they have got something to say to the press, call a press conference and make a release.

You are talking about bilingualism. I am not very hot on that. As a matter of fact, I am not even lukewarm, but there was a point in time when I said, "Well, if that's what it takes to keep this country going, let's do it and get on with our lives." Then Quebec came out with its law, I do not know what the number of it is, but no English signs. They hired their own little—I was going to say Gestapo,

but I guess they had a little police force to police that and report people and prosecute them.

1240

I ask you, where is the reason in that? Supposedly the feel that it is necessary to protect their culture and the language and that it is the right thing to do. Yet when a few municipalities in Ontario this year declared English only and I believe that was probably as much for the economic justice of it as anything, they became French-bashing bigots. But some poor little fellow up the Pontiac in Shawville or somewhere who has had a general store for the last 50 years has to take down his sign that says "General Store" because this is protecting the culture and French language. I would say that if their culture and language is that weak maybe they should do it a favour and put it out of misery.

Sovereignty-association certainly would not work because the way they have presented it anyway in this Allaire report, they would be wielding a bigger balance of power than they do now. Separation is almost geographically and economically impossible, but if that is what it takes, maybe we should try to work it out. That way, we would save money on the bilingual expenses that we have.

There were a couple of points mentioned here, the historical rights of the francophones in Ontario. Now stop me if I am wrong, but when I went to school the BNA, where Wolfe and Montcalm had their little skirmish and afterwards said that the Quebec people or Lower Canada or whatever it was at that time could retain their language. I do not think it said anything about Upper Canada or Ontario, so we call it.

I also find that today the people around here are sort of typical of Canada. A lot of them, not them all—I have been here since before 10 o'clock—but a lot of the people came in just in time for their little private presentation and immediately left. They did not hang around to find out what the other guys were going to say, and my main point is that we need dialogue.

The Chair: Thank you very much, ma'am. I think we recognize as a committee the need for a continuing dialogue as you pointed out, and we will be trying to see how we can structure that in the second stage of our work, even more so than we have this first part.

STORMONT, DUNDAS, GLENGARRY
LEGAL CLINIC

The Chair: I come back now to Étienne St-Aubin.

Mr St-Aubin: If I may, Mr Chairman, I applied for the opportunity to address you at this point as director of the Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry Legal Clinic from a different perspective than that which I brought to you a few moments ago.

The province of Ontario is going through this very important exercise at a time when obviously, as your document puts forward, there is a great deal of change in our province. The opportunity of this process to deal with issues which perhaps have not been in the forefront of considerations in constitutional discussions is there. Depending on one's political point of view, the election of a New Democratic government in Ontario was akin to

miracle and therefore expectations are extremely high on the part of persons who hope that a perspective which may not have been in the forefront gets there and stays there.

I think it is appropriate for the province of Ontario in any discussions involving the Constitution not only to be the engine of our Canadian economy, as it has always been referred to, but perhaps to be the engine of social justice. In the context of the Charter of Rights, which is our Constitution at the moment, it would be appropriate that provisions be inserted that would reflect the preoccupation for equality of opportunity in this province, that in effect we deal with a social charter.

I feel how relevant it is to be addressing you on something of this nature in this particular community. It is a community which works very hard for everything it gets. It is a community which has not been favoured by an easy life in any shape or form. You only have to step out of this hall and breathe the air to see, for example, the ravages of pollution in this jurisdiction, and you have only to visit Osoyoos to see the effects of inequality.

I recognize that a Constitution does not of itself make people happy and governments of themselves cannot do that, but at the best and I think that at least if a Constitution is going to be considered at all and if governments take many steps at all, it can be towards trying to help to create conditions in which people can at least aspire to some measure of happiness.

In this community, issues of social justice are issues of daily life, and I hope therefore that any constitutional consideration reflects those fundamentals of daily issues and at this aspect be taken into account in deciding what is the future of Ontario. I will not take up more of your time, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you. We will carry on then.

RONALD BERGERON

The Chair: I call Ronald Bergeron.

Mr Bergeron: I have some copies made, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: That is fine. We can get additional ones made. Thank you. Our clerk will just pick them up. Go ahead.

Mr Bergeron: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentleman, I imagine you are all anxious to get home after one month of being the lightning-rod for all the problems in Ontario. I would like to thank you for taking that time. We all need to reflect and consider where we are coming from and where we want to go.

Let me begin by telling you about my eldest daughter, Lianne, who recently wrote to us from France. She had just finished working in Paris as part of a work exchange program and was on her way to Florence, Italy, to study Italian. She wrote: "My heart is in Canada. My pride is in Canada." What did she see that we do not seem to see? I thought of her life experiences. My wife is English-speaking and I am French-speaking. We have both learned each other's first language and the culture attached to it and have passed it on to our six children.

They have attended French-language schools and are fluent in both French and English, not just in language, but

in nuances, humour, puns, etc. They delight in making "la tite" and celebrating St Patrick's Day. They will split a gut laughing at "Rock et Belles Oreilles" and they will cheer our local Glen Productions. We have travelled as a family to Awkwesane, les Cantons de l'Est, les Escoumains, Montréal, Ste-Adèle, Sudbury, Niagara Falls, Midland, British Columbia and farther outside of Canada.

A few years ago, Lianne spent a week at the Terry Fox Centre in Ottawa. This was a Canadian experience where some 100 students from across Canada gathered together. It was an intense experience where many of the students became fast friends and did not want to leave.

1250

It was only at that time that she realized how fortunate she was to be bilingual. She spent much of her time translating for the students from British Columbia and Quebec. She became aware that French humour and English humour differ, that language is more than words. The interesting thing was how all these students made it work, no matter their backgrounds or differences.

In succeeding years she was an exchange student in France and in Italy. In turn, we have had students from those countries in our home, as well as visitors from Iceland and Britain. We have all been enriched by these experiences.

Last September Lianne drove alone across Ontario and western Canada. This was at the time of post-Meech failure and the boiling pot of Oka. She stayed at friends of ours or in bed and breakfast homes. She returned in October so enthusiastic about the friendly people she had met and so enthralled by the beauty of the land.

Here we were so hangdog about the future of Canada, and here she was so full of optimism. Why the difference? Quite simply, while we were all watching TV and reading newspapers, she was sharing meals with our neighbours.

There are a number of lessons in this. There is nothing wrong with the people of Canada, and this is recognized worldwide. Exchanges work, not just overseas but here in Canada. We need more exchanges, opportunities to meet each other, not just for students but also for adults, and not just French-English but north-south, east-west, within a province and within our country. To paraphrase an old Indian saying, "Let me not judge another until I have walked a day in his moccasins."

If there is nothing wrong with the people of Canada, what is it then that so infuriates me, that makes me so concerned? I believe I can sum it up in two words: government and media.

First, to government. Every time I turn around, I hear about unity or the lack of it, of Canada disappearing or being strong, all from the mouths of politicians. Most of the time I get the feeling that the provincial and federal governments do not care about me. Rather, they are more interested in increasing their own power by trying to give me more rather than better government.

It does not matter where I turn, one level of Big Brother is sticking it to me. "Well, how about a 3% payroll tax?" "Hey, I can top that. How about a 7% GST?"

I watch helplessly as the justice system lets the rights of the accused outweigh the rights of the victims. To top it off, we are governed by parties where the majority has

voted against it. For example, in Ontario, 62% did not vote for the NDP. I think at the federal level, what, 50%, 60% did not vote for the Conservatives. These are the people who are trying to define unity for me.

It seems to me that in a power struggle, the federal government has defined "unity is equal to centralized government is equal to good" and therefore "bad is decentralized government is equal to disunity."

Then to thicken the broth, the French-English situation is added. There are few things as loaded with emotion in Canada as English-French relations, and I have lived it at first hand several times.

As rational as we want to be, we cannot escape our feelings. When we react to Clyde Wells or the burning of the Quebec flag, there are very strong emotions, emotions that cloud facts and colour our perspective.

It is essential that the language issues be kept separate from the discussion on the format of government. The issue is centralized versus decentralized government. That is not a constitutional problem, in my opinion, but rather a management problem.

Arguing for or against government does not make someone for or against Canada. Let me show you some confusion here. Look at this headline from the Ottawa Citizen. It says "Quebec Employers Back Canada." The article reads, right off the bat, "Strong Majority Support a United Canada." It sounds like they are backing Mulroney's centralized concept. But wait, there is a bit more here. It says, "A united but decentralized Canada is the preferred choice."

I think oft-times the same train of thought is being stated by many western and native Canadians. I want to see decentralized government, but not to the point of a void, and just decentralization should be not just federal-provincial but also provincial-municipal.

I want accountability. I want a say in what is being done to myself, my family, my community. I guess you could say, "Yes, small is beautiful." I want a changed management style. I want an election process that reflects our diversity of opinion and I want our representatives to have the freedom to vote according to their conscience.

I enjoy being a Canadian. I think we have a country that is great. I find, sadly, it seems to be not because of the government but in spite of it.

As to the press, if ever there was a group of people who have done more to spread hatred or incite unrest and create dissension in this country, it has to be the CBC, CTV and the major news media.

Consider the infamous Brockville incident where photos and video footage were taken of some people burning the Quebec flag. The media focused on close-up shots of this, spread them as quickly as possible across Canada. It gave an impact in Quebec of a redneck Ontario. There were reactions from Quebec, subsequent reactions to reactions from Ontario as the news flashed back and forth between reporters bent on a story.

Here was a classic example of sensationalism which was sure to cause conflict. Yes, the flags were burned, but why the close-up shots? Because long shots would have shown how few people were involved and this would diminish

the impact. There was no perspective. One of my sons was at school in Brockville at the time, a French student in a English environment at Grenville Christian College, where he never encountered the bigotry that the press was trying to lead us to believe was typical of all Ontario.

Are there bigots and rednecks? Of course, but they are a tiny minority, yet the press plays up the conflict to the point that we start to believe that is all there is to this country. And in believing it, we make it happen.

The post-Meech Lake bitterness was going on at the time when my daughter was crossing the west of Canada. According to the media's view of the west, she should have found herself treated as an outsider, but wherever she went she found friendliness.

The Chair: Mr Bergeron, could you sum up, please.

Mr Bergeron: Okay. We have also used the word "crisis." I like to save that word "crisis" for things like starvation in Ethiopia and a war in Kuwait. We have differences of opinion.

I would like to point out that the local media in small communities, in my opinion, are generally quite good. These reporters know their communities. They work an play and socialize with their citizens. If they do not get story right, they are quickly reminded. In other words, accountability forces good reporting.

In summary, I think we should establish substantive exchange programs, separate language issues from management issues, minimize and decentralize government, change the election process and encourage the news media to be responsible.

I read recently about a Mexican and a Salvadoran who died near Niagara Falls as they tried to enter Canada illegally. We cry about Canada heading for oblivion and yet they died trying to come here. What did they see that we have not seen?

Let us remember, there is nothing wrong with the people of Canada. Let us build on that. The essence of Canada is worth the effort. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

1300

KEN DAVIES

The Chair: We will move to the next speaker, Ken Davies.

Mr Davies: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Ken Davies. I am a private citizen and I am here to represent and express my own personal views and opinions.

I would first like to congratulate Premier Bob Rae and all the members of the NDP on their overwhelming victory at the last election. Bob Rae demonstrated that a person who listens is rewarded.

These hearings and the opportunity afforded me today are a further demonstration of the integrity, willingness and a fresh new approach of our present provincial government.

Before responding to some of the questions posed in the excellent discussion paper, I would like to make comment with reference to page 23: "Please, we want you

ews" and "Please, time is short." Please do not make this the Mulroney 23 June deadline.

I am sure we all appreciate that the committee has to file an interim report. If the only statement that could be made on 21 March were, "We need more time," that would be neither an understatement nor a reflection on the committee's ability to consult and present the views of the people of this province.

More than a century has passed since the Fathers of Confederation drew up the British North America Act. In 1882 Pierre Trudeau made a few modifications and called it the Constitution. He introduced the "notwithstanding" clause, which allowed Quebec to implement the new English law. In 1990, Brian Mulroney took the first ministers to Meech Lake and succeeded in creating more dissension in this country than its history has ever seen. We are hypothetically back to 1867. So what is the hurry for a new constitution?

I would like to bring your attention to Premier Bob's note on page 23 of this discussion paper: "No one political party or no one government is going to 'save Canada' or be the vehicle or the only vehicle for national unity.... We are all going to be involved in this process of reconstruction, discovery, renewal and recovery."

Please note the number of re's in that statement. These are the kinds of words we are hearing with reference to the Gulf war: recovery, renewal, reconstruction. Are these words indicative of the divisions and damage that Canada has suffered in recent years? I believe they are.

Many Canadians are concerned that the nation is undergoing changes that threaten to destroy the very essence of what which has made us the envy of the world; namely, our multicultural mosaic and the will to coexist peacefully. Today we have the opportunity to build a superstructure designed by the people and for the people, and since such a document is to express the will of the people, it is imperative that pending and future amendments be designed, approved and implemented by the people. The experts can labour over the words, but the intent belongs to the people. The right and freedom of each and every Canadian to participate in constitutional reform must be revered.

The vehicle for this is the referendum. Canada needs a Magna Carta, an impregnable document derived from the people, written by the people and amendable only by national referendum. There are those who would say a referendum is too cumbersome, too slow, and those who believe constitutions can only be written and understood by legal minds or politicians. Recent history has shown that constitutional reforms cannot be entrusted to our appointed representatives. Meech Lake was a disaster and a national disgrace, and such a debacle must never happen again.

It may take several years to formulate the tenets of a Canadian Constitution, but ultimately, if all Canadians participate, it will be seen as time well spent. Remember, thanks to Brian Mulroney we are now back in 1867. Let us do it right this time. The referendum is the only way.

I would now like to address some of the questions from the discussion paper.

To say that free trade has disrupted the Canadian and Ontario economies is a gross understatement. This area,

Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, is suffering economic starvation as a direct result of free trade. The disastrous consequences of the present agreement were clear to the majority of Canadians. Quebec did not want free trade, but in giving unanimous support to its native son Mulroney, it gave away the store. Free trade was a very important issue and should have been decided by referendum.

How we manage our economy is one of the most important issues facing us now and in the future. Canada is vast and diverse, sparsely populated, rich in natural resources and lacking in conversion of resources to finished product. We should put more effort and finances into manufacturing, selling products made from our natural resources, rather than buying them back from offshore producers.

With regard to the aboriginal peoples, it is easy to say that they have the same opportunities, the same rights and freedoms as every other Canadian, but is that really true? Technically, yes, it is.

I do not purport to understand native land claims, but I know that they are a very contentious issue between Canadian governments and the aboriginals. I do not believe the settlement of land claims would improve housing and facilities, decrease violence or have any effect on the high mortality of young Indians. The same scene of poverty, violence and death can be found in any society that does not value all of its inhabitants. The aboriginals have been patronized and shunned in the same moment. It is hard to have dignity and self-esteem when you are rejected. I know; I have been unemployed for almost three years thanks to free trade.

Work is the answer to having dignity. The opportunity to earn a living and provide for one's family is paramount to solving the problems besetting our native peoples today. The aboriginals have many talents. They are holding a lemon. Let us help them to make lemonade. This is addressing the needs of the aboriginals. When they have work, they will have dignity, some of their problems will abate and Canada will be the winner.

Should aboriginals have the right to manage their own affairs in Canada? Yes, of course they should, to the same extent as other Canadians manage their own affairs within the framework of federal, provincial, municipal and local legislation. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms provides for every Canadian without exception the right to live, work and play within a very liberal society. I do not believe Canadians would ever support the recognition of aboriginal laws and/or customs contrary to the charter.

1310

What are the roles of the English and French languages and Quebec's future in Canada?

There can be no doubt that the battle for constitutional reform, that is, Meech Lake, was a battle for power; power for the federal government, power for the provinces, power for women, power for aboriginals, but most of all, power for Quebec. The province of Quebec wants an inordinate amount of exclusive rights and privileges in order to exercise power both inside and outside its territorial boundaries.

In the moment that an individual or group is granted special status, persons not included may be offended. Most non-French-speaking persons are acutely offended by the audacity of Quebec daring to consider itself a distinct society in a country that has been pioneered and developed by many nationalities. The founders are the aboriginals who were conquered by the French, and they in turn by the British.

The Chair: Mr Davies, perhaps you would sum up, please.

Mr Davies: Yes.

I am proud of my heritage and I come from a nation that has left its mark all around the world, but I do not think this gives me the right to claim special privileges, rights or freedoms over any other human being on this earth. The "distinct society" notion is repulsive, very contentious, incitive, divisive and undermines the sacred fundamentals of equality. Special status for Quebec or the aboriginals, if conceded, would be the beginning of claims that would plague the nation ad infinitum.

The charter protects cultures, languages and religions that exist in Canada today. Neither a Constitution nor any amount of legislation will preserve them. This has to come from the will of the people involved.

Does Quebec want to be in Confederation? This is really up to Quebec. Historically, the French French are notoriously fickle, and this characteristic is true of Quebecers. They supported 100% the Liberal Party for native son Pierre Trudeau, and overnight switched party allegiance to the PCs to support next native son Brian Mulroney. They face a dilemma in the next federal election, because the incumbent and the opposition leader are both native sons.

The Chair: I am sorry, Mr Davies, I am going to have to stop you.

Mr Davies: Thank you very much.

LUC GUINDON

The Chair: Could I call next Luc Guindon? Mr Guindon is also a former MPP from this area. We welcome Mr Guindon to our committee.

Mr Guindon: If I have your permission, I would just in my way like to welcome you to Cornwall. It is nice to see everybody here this morning still bright and still very enthusiastic after a long three weeks. I would like to especially mention a former colleague of mine who travelled long distances on the social development committee on Bill 30, and that is the member for Mississauga North. I am glad to see him here in Cornwall.

Mr Chairman, may I first of all thank you and the members of this committee for taking the time to listen to my views on the constitutional crisis in Canada. We are facing an important turning point in the history of this country. We sense that unless a real consensus can be forged, we will be faced with very troubled and trying times ahead. The task that confronts you is an urgent one and we hope your support will become a substantial contribution towards a satisfactory solution.

Listening to the variety of briefs presented to you, it is clear that a consensus is nowhere yet in sight. Constitutional

issues, one is tempted to say, seem to bring out the worst in Canadians. Every region, every province and every minority group want its interests enshrined in the Constitution. Far from being a heightened consciousness of basic human rights, this fact is a measure of the deep distrust that is pervasive across this land. Indeed the constitutional discussions of the last two decades have over the years poisoned the political climate in this country.

Everyone agrees that the Meech Lake accord had a disastrous ending and that it was a fiasco and that it ultimately exacerbated the political impasse it was designed to resolve. It has indeed resulted in polarized politics. It has brought the constitutional process down to the level of bickering party politics. It has sapped the credibility of two major political parties. Never have we seen both their leaders so passionately resented by massive segments of the Canadian population, Jean Chrétien in his native province and the Prime Minister in most others.

The ascription of blame is not my purpose here, nor is my concern the autopsy of the Meech Lake fiasco. I am concerned with two questions. The first is, to have reached this low point, where have we gone wrong? What are the flawed policies that led us to our current state of polarized politics? And the second question I will raise concerns the role the province of Ontario might play to be part of a solution to this crisis.

It would be self-deceiving to think that the problem facing Canada started with the Meech Lake debacle. It is equally naïve to believe that the Meech Lake accord, had it been passed, would have constituted a lasting solution. But it is true to say that its rejection, and especially the manner in which it was rejected, have added to the problems facing this country.

It is clear to me that the road that has led us to our present quandary was entered upon some two decades ago. Let me explain. When Lester B. Pearson, as prime minister of Canada, struck the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, in defining its terms of reference, he spoke of the two "founding races," emphasizing in that outdated expression the dual nature of Canada as a country, a fact that the French expression, "les deux peuples fondateurs," had always conveyed. Pearson expected this commission to forge a bilingual language policy that would satisfy the changing needs of this country.

It has been argued, and I agree with the argument, that the royal commission recommended a language regime that in effect deepened the language conflict that it was expected to resolve. It refused to adopt a territorially based language policy that would have recognized the basic French character of Quebec and the basic English character of the rest of Canada. The commission refused to take the territorial route because it claimed it could not bring itself to condemn the francophone communities outside Quebec to death, so instead it proclaimed a bilingual Canada from sea to sea. It created two official minorities and designed a language policy to accommodate them, rather than the two founding peoples that Pearson had charged them to do. Canada thereby become the only democratic country in the world to create official minorities among its citizens.

Has this language regime increased the viability of French communities outside Quebec? The answer is a clear and definite no. It had already been established at the time of the commission's sitting that outside the bilingual belt from Sault Ste Marie to Moncton, the assimilation of francophones was proceeding at rates that varied from 5% to 90% per generation. It was equally clear that even within the bilingual belt, the economic basis of French communities in their traditional habitat was eroding since they were involved in farming, lumbering, fishing and mining, and none of these are growth sectors in a modernizing economy.

Furthermore, inasmuch as such communities stayed economically viable, they became capital and not labour intensive and therefore could not accommodate any population growth. When demographic growth did take place in additional communities around the nation's capital, it was more an influx of anglophones and francophones, thereby changing both the composition and the dynamics of community life. The problem of bilingualism in Ontario is not that the English learn French, but to ensure that Franco-Ontarians retain their language. Once the Franco-Ontarians are all bilingual, and they now are, French as a language is in great danger of not being grounded in the needs of everyday life.

Natural social forces are bringing this about and well-meaning state policies can do nothing to stop them from endangering its survival. In such a case whether minority language rights are entrenched or not in the Constitution, the ultimate outcome will be the same. The P  pin-Robarts Task Force on Canadian Unity realized this and John Robarts testified his opposition to the constitutional entrenchment of minority language rights at hearings of the House of Commons. What the entrenchment of minority and language rights in the Constitution does achieve is to institutionalize the political bickering and disunity in this and, and I suppose, to ensure the economic prosperity of constitutional lawyers who would otherwise be condemned to a modest academic status.

If the viability of French communities outside Quebec has been eroded by natural social forces, one must also mention that this erosion has equally been accelerated by the fact that the provincial state has had, because of the cost involved, to take over the funding and the administration of the health, welfare and educational institutions from the churches and the local communities.

This process of state-initiated modernization has further eroded the embeddedness of French in the requirements of daily life. The establishment of the welfare state had the probably unintended consequence of increasing bilingualism in the traditional French communities and of further undermining the usefulness of French in meeting one's daily needs. Given these circumstances, it is fitting that the provinces facilitate the maintenance of their maternal tongue to its minority. But such provisions can more easily be successfully implemented by interprovincial agreements than by constitutional entrenchment. Some steps in that direction had been taken by a number of provinces until the Trudeau government stepped in to quash these initiatives.

1320

In Quebec the same process of state-initiated modernization, known as the Quiet Revolution, forced for the first time the anglophone population to face up to its minority status. While the problem of bilingualism outside Quebec was to find ways for the francophones to maintain their language, the problem in Quebec was and still remains to have the anglophones and most of the immigrants to effectively become bilingual. It would not be unfair to say that historically they never had any natural inclination to become so, nor was there any necessity for them to do so since they had a complete set of segregated institutions.

The official language policy of this country has been designed not to accelerate but to impede the needed changes in Quebec society. Only in Quebec is there a language barrier that burdens the majority of its population to become bilingual to access a very important part of the corporate economy in its midst. The French majority of Quebec, now that it has become fully qualified since the Quiet Revolution, is keenly aware of this retrograde character of the official language policy. Not only does it not force the corporate world to adapt to the population it should serve, but it also sends the wrong signal to the immigrants of Quebec where they are also led to believe that they may choose to learn English instead of French.

Inasmuch as the situation has changed in Quebec over the last few years, it has not been because of but in spite of the official language policy of this country.

I assume that the nature and character of my dissent from the official language policy of this country and the direction of the current constitutional discussions are sufficiently clear. Let me summarize. While Canada can legally proclaim itself to be a bilingual country from sea to sea, it is proclaiming a myth and not a social fact. Nor will that myth ever become a fact. A bilingual Quebec in an English Canada will never cut the mustard with the Qu  b  cois majority. The only grounds on which a national consensus might still be feasible is not to shoot for the stars but to settle for a French Quebec in an English Canada.

When Clyde Wells read the content of the Allaire report—that is the constitutional white paper of the provincial Liberal Party of Quebec—he recently stated in an interview with Radio-Canada that he would prefer sovereignty-association to this version of renewed federalism. The defeat of the Meech Lake accord may now represent, even to Clyde Wells, a hollow victory. The Allaire report was imperative for the provincial Liberal Party if it intended to maintain any political credibility with the Qu  b  cois electorate. Renewed federalism Trudeau-style is now only embodied by the Equality Party of Quebec and Jean Chr  tien's federal Liberal party.

I am convinced that the government of Ontario can play a very important and positive role in finding a solution to the current constitutional deadlock. I suggest that it could urge the Canadian Parliament to reach back to the Pearson terms of reference and start from scratch. This consensus would be based on a language policy tailored to the needs of the two majorities in Canada rather than its official minorities, for a refreshing change.

Rather than taking the route of constitutional entrenchments, realistic policy objectives could be defined and interprovincial agreements encouraged to facilitate the minorities to maintain their mother tongue. Reasonable rather than polarized politics might again become possible. Such a radical departure from the confrontational politics we have been accustomed to by the Trudeau regime for nearly two decades would constitute a welcome change of pace still difficult to imagine.

Ontario and Quebec, one should remember, are each other's major trading partner. This shared economic interest should favour the voices of reason and moderation in the search for common understanding. Whether the Québécois opt to stay in a basically modified federal state or whether they opt for sovereignty, one should be acutely aware that both Ontario and Quebec stand to lose much if spite rather than reason prevails. That, in my opinion, is why the report of your committee may be vitally important. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Guindon. That concludes the printed list of speakers. Mr Beer, very briefly, because I want to give an opportunity to one other group that was left off the list, and we are running way behind time.

Mr Beer: Very briefly, Mr Guindon, I just want to be clear on your concept. There could be agreement, for example, between Ontario and Quebec or Quebec and New Brunswick whereby each of those governments would say, for example, "We'll provide education in the French language in Ontario," or "We'll ensure education in the English language in Quebec under certain kinds of conditions," and that would be an agreement between those two provinces. It could be in other fields. But you are saying do it that way rather than protecting a right to education in either French or English through the Constitution.

Mr Guindon: That is right. For 20 years it has not worked. The entrenchment of linguistic rights and minorities has not worked. I am sure you have heard a lot about it. It has been very ugly with Meech Lake, and we are not heading in a better direction, I do not believe personally. If the provinces start speaking to each other in a better tone of voice and making arrangements between themselves, between Quebec-New Brunswick, Quebec-Ontario or any provinces, to me, that would assure the Francophone population of Ontario as many services as they need to survive. That is basically my point, that I do not see personally that the entrenchment in the Constitution made any difference in the last 20 years; I mean, not counting what the province of Ontario did.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

CORNWALL COLLEGIATE AND VOCATIONAL INSTITUTE

The Chair: Is Kristianne Ross from Cornwall Collegiate here? Yes. I gather that the students from Cornwall Collegiate were mistakenly left off the list, so I would like to give them an opportunity to speak to us briefly, and then conclude our session here in Cornwall. I apologize to all those people who had wanted to be added to the list, but

time simply will not allow it. We need to move on this afternoon to our next stop in Kingston.

Mr Sylvester: My name is Brian Sylvester. I am also a student at Cornwall Collegiate. As you know, we are the future of Canada as a nation. I am extremely proud to be Canadian. Being a Canadian to me means being part of the most extraordinary and one of the most unique countries in the world. In a recent poll done by Xerox of Canada 93% of all Canadians believe they are living in the greatest country in the world. I am in total agreement with that.

When I think of Canada I think of Ontario and Quebec sharing a provincial border, not an international one. I think as a nation and as citizens of this nation we really underestimate how important the impact of Quebec separating from the union would be. I believe it would set off a chain reaction around the country. The maritime province would probably opt to join the United States, a very good possibility of that, and then they would not have a link to Canada. And there is a good chance that BC would either join the US or form its own country, as it has little association with Canada as a whole as it is.

1330

We also stand to lose a lot on the world stage. Our credibility and clout in the UN would be severely diminished and our reputation and the way we are highly regarded as one of the élite countries of the world would be virtually destroyed.

In short, if Quebec separates the Canadian pride would be depleted almost to the point of extinction, and the embarrassment would be phenomenal. If it takes giving in to Quebec to save and preserve this land of lakes and rivers then it is crucial we do so. I think we must do that to save this country. It is more important than values. I believe there must be a limit to what we give in to, but what is it? I say we cannot get all the premiers and the Prime Minister together like last June and get them discussing this? Take the information that you are getting from this and the Spicer survey and give that to them, and then get them in a room and do not put a time limit on it. Just let them discuss this and eventually someone is going to lean one way or the other and something has to get solved.

We have established the lock; now we must find the key and be the masters of Canada's destiny. Thank you.

Ms Ross: I spoke to a variety of different students and I am the spokesperson for the group, who did this speech. To start with, we feel that currently we are the biggest part of Canada. We are that strong link in the chain that is keeping it all together and—another metaphor, if you will—we are the wheel and the other provinces are the spokes. We are the richest province, we have the largest population, we are resource-rich, with the Great Lakes and the various minerals. Also, the capital of Canada is in Ontario, and that attracts a great deal of people, and we should be focusing on culture and tradition within the capital.

As it is right now, we are a unifying force. However, we feel in the future that Ontario needs to take its leadership role and use its superior lobbying power to do good. For instance, we should continue to be a unifying body for the country and we should try to set an example with bilingualism.

We were the first province to really do something about the French, and we feel bilingualism should be encouraged throughout all of Canada, not because we are giving in to Quebec but because we are acknowledging the fact that French and English were—how can I put this?—founding bodies for the country. We feel it is very important for the country to acknowledge, through either having bilingual signs or having bilingual schools, that the French people are wanted.

Also, we feel that Ontario should develop its resources in the northern region of the province. This would create jobs, and we feel the federal and provincial governments should be willing to give a little bit of aid for that.

Ontario is the only province that can pull the country together, because we are very close to the Quebec border so we know how they feel, and we have a pretty even mix, or as close as we are going to get, of French and English cultures in the province as opposed to other provinces. We also can sympathize with the plight of the other provinces. I feel that in order for every link in the chain to be strong, the strongest link now needs to do something about it. Premier Rae has to grasp the opportunity he has been given and have a Canada for all Canadians. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr Sylvester: Just one note on bilingualism. In Ontario, in order to get our diploma as students, we have to take one compulsory French credit. I think that is one-sided, because I do not believe that in Quebec they have to take one English credit to get their diploma.

The Chair: I think that may be the case, that they may in fact have to do that. I guess we can check that.

Thank you very much for your presentation and thank you to all the people who presented to us this morning. We have had, once again, a fascinating array of perspectives put before us and they will be useful in our work as a committee.

We again apologize to those people we were not able to add to the list, time being what it is. We need to move on this afternoon to Kingston, and invite you to continue following our proceedings over the parliamentary channel if you are so interested. Thank you very much. We are recessed.

The committee recessed at 1336.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1642 in Memorial Hall, City Hall, Kingston.

The Chair: If I can call the meeting to order. Thank you. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are happy to be here in Kingston, Ontario, in the city hall at Memorial Hall. This is of course the meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, and we are proceeding during our fourth week of hearings across the province to hear the views of Ontarians on the future of the country and particularly the role of the province and the aspirations of the people of the province with respect to some of the changes in Confederation.

We apologize for the lateness in getting started here in Kingston. We sat late this afternoon in Cornwall and we were a little bit late in leaving there to arrive here. So we apologize for that, but we will extend the time to ensure that all of the speakers who are on our printed list get heard. We also of course have another session, so we will provide another opportunity there for people to speak to us as well.

What I would like to do is just to indicate—as you can see from the printed list if you have a copy, and there are copies at the back—for those people who are on the list, we have unfortunately had to limit the time to about 10 minutes and would appreciate your understanding in that it is simply the only way that we can get through providing as many people as possible an opportunity to speak.

I do want to say, because I know there has been some concern about people perhaps not getting on to the list, that as important as this process is for us, we do not see that this is the end of the process, but simply the beginning, and we will be certainly looking, as we put together our interim report towards the end of March, at the whole question of how we can ensure that the discussions around these important issues can continue and how the public can continue to be involved in those processes and those discussions. So although the format may be different, we certainly intend very seriously to ensure that that happens.

What I would like to do before proceeding with the list is just to introduce the members of the committee. This is a committee that is made up, as you may know, of representatives from the three political parties, and I am happy to introduce the members of the committee. In addition to myself, from the NDP caucus we have Gary Malkowski; Marilyn Churley; Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee; Fred Wilson; David Winninger, and Gary Wilson, also the local member. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, who is out actually making a phone call on behalf of the committee, so he will be joining us shortly, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer, and from the Conservative caucus, Charles Harnick. Our other member, Ernie Eves, is not with us today.

CHINESE CANADIANS
OF KINGSTON AND DISTRICT

The Chair: We want to start then with the first group, the Chinese Canadian National Council, the Kingston chapter, Mabel Chau.

Mrs Chau: Good afternoon, members of the committee ladies and gentlemen in the audience. Thank you very much for the invitation and the opportunity to share our views regarding the future of Canada. It really is a privilege and honour for me to be able to address the committee today.

First, we would like to address the issue of how Canada can secure a future in the international economy. How can we ensure that we become more competitive internationally?

It is obvious that in order to be a prosperous nation, we have to export more goods and services outside of Canada. We must unite to become a common front to gain economic competitiveness. We must combine our technology and resources to make Canada truly competitive in a global economy.

How can we achieve these goals? We have the following suggestions:

1. Canada must take the path of high technology. Both federal and provincial governments should pay more attention to universities and technical institutions for research and development, science and technology, and then we must develop markets for exporting the high technology. In this way we can make the best use of our resources.

2. We must raise our standards in science and technology in schools. Canadian students score lower in tests in the mathematics and science subjects, especially at the high school level, compared to students in other developed countries in the world. If this trend continues, then Canada will fall behind in these subjects and we will lose our competitive edge in technology. We should raise awareness of science and technology in the general public and raise the standards for these subjects in high schools and universities.

3. We have to promote quality improvement in our products and services. As the people around us are becoming more sophisticated and demanding for what they can get for their dollar's worth, business is getting to be tougher than ever and more competitive. We must outdo our competitors in order to survive. Quality improvement in all areas of products and services is the answer.

People have to be educated in the benefits of quality improvement, which includes improving our productivity and our efficiency, and they have to be taught the technique of quality planning and quality control. Also, management styles have to change. They have to bring decision-making closer to the workers, who can then identify with and be responsible for and also be proud of the quality of the products which they produce. Quality in a product or service is the ultimate factor which will provide us with a competitive edge and bring economic success in both domestic and global markets.

That finishes our first issue. Next, we want to address the issue of, what does Ontario want?

Speaking for the Chinese community of Kingston, we say that above all we want a prosperous Ontario and a strong and free Canada. As Canadians, the Chinese com-

unity will do everything to work along with other Canadians to strive for these goals.

What are the common values that we share as Canadians?

For us, they are compassion for fellow human beings and social justice. We believe in freedom and democracy. Our social system is different from those of other countries in that we are more compassionate. We care more about the weak, the poor, the oppressed, the young and the old. We are very proud to be part of that social system and we would like to continue to be that way.

The following are a few points raised at a discussion meeting among our group.

First, regarding immigration, we would like to see the integrity of the present immigration policy be maintained. The present level of immigration services to new immigrants is very good but can be better publicized among new immigrants so that they can be better informed.

650

Second, regarding language, we would like to see the heritage language rights protected and preserved. We feel that the language program should meet the needs of local communities.

Third, regarding racial discrimination, as discrimination arises out of ignorance, multiculturalism should be promoted to improve better understanding of other people and their cultures. Education would eradicate stereotyping, and Canadian history should include the contribution of every ethnic community.

Fourth, regarding human rights, modern Canadian history should retell the injustices inflicted upon the human rights of the Chinese community, such as the head tax and the Chinese exclusion act and the incarceration of the Ukrainians and the Japanese communities during the First World War and Second World War, so that such injustices should never be repeated to any other community of people.

Fifth, regarding employment, job training programs are inadequate. However, there can be more affirmative action such as hiring minority groups, equal pay for equal jobs and increased hiring of women. In other words, every effort should be made to undo the injustices done in the past.

Sixth, regarding health, the universal health system must be maintained to ensure that all Canadians have the right to quality health care. The present cost-sharing system between the provincial and federal governments will ensure that.

Given all the above points, how can we achieve those goals?

For a first step, multiculturalism should be promoted at all levels. Multiculturalism promotes awareness of the cultural or ethnic diversity of the peoples of Canada. Cultural or ethnic differences or distinctiveness between people have to be accepted and respected instead of suppressed. Once these differences are recognized, people can start to understand each other, their ways of thinking, their concerns and interests. Then they can work together and by consensus arrive at some common goals which are in the best of everybody's interests. The magic word here is "consensus."

Some people may be sceptical about multiculturalism. Indeed, it may produce adverse effects if people's differ-

ences are used to create a hierarchy of classes where one class or culture assumes superiority over another class or culture. Where one group dominates over other groups or forces conformity, then this would lead to oppression and inequalities among the groups, which may eventually lead to division among the people. That is not what we want. We want unity in Canada.

That is why the real meaning of multiculturalism must be clarified and understood by all. Multiculturalism is not to encourage the development of distinct subcultures within Canada, which are independent and isolated from each other. Multiculturalism is to facilitate understanding and communication between the different subcultures of people in trying to work together so that differences and distinctiveness can be recognized, accepted and respected. These differences should be used to complement each other to enrich a broader culture, which is the greater Canadian culture or identity.

In order for there to be communication between the subcultures, people have to come out of their community and interact with each other and try to understand the interests and needs of other communities. In this way, there will be a true dialogue and communication between the different communities of people, and then we can arrive at a consensus of common values and aspirations which we can share as fellow Canadians.

Multiculturalism should be promoted at all levels. The multicultural program in Kingston right now has been very successful under the direction of the Canadian Folk Arts Council. However, it should not be limited just to folk arts alone; it should be extended to every part of the community. We would like to see continued or increased support in areas such as education, language and immigrant services.

Ontario should assume the role of leadership in the promotion of multiculturalism because of the ethnic and cultural diversity of its population and use this opportunity to demonstrate to other provinces and other countries in the world that it is possible for a nation of people of different ethnic backgrounds to live together peacefully, upholding common values while respecting diversity, each working and contributing to a strong and united Canada. Thank you and have a good afternoon.

The Chair: If you would just wait one minute, there is one question from one of the members. Thank you for your presentation. Mr Offer.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation on basically two areas, first, the role of economic growth, which this committee is hearing a great deal as being crucially important to our country as a whole and indeed our province, and second, the whole question of the multicultural aspect of not only this province but this country.

My question deals with that second aspect, the multicultural fabric of the province. We have had on other occasions people make presentations which talk to the potential need for the inclusion in our Constitution of a clause which reflects not only the anglo, francophone and first nations founding aspect of the country but also the multicultural aspect as almost as important a part of our country, and I am wondering if you could share with us whether

you believe there is a role in the province to promote a constitutional amendment which embraces the multicultural contribution to this country.

Mrs Chau: I think it is desirable, of course, but if it cannot be implemented in the immediate future, we are no doubt going in that direction if multiculturalism is first promoted. That would come as a result.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs Chau. Thank you very much.

CENTRE FRONTENAC

The Chair: I call next Gabriel Toussaint, du Centre Frontenac.

M. Toussaint : Mon nom est Gabriel Toussaint. Je vous présente ce mémoire au nom du centre francophone de Kingston. Le Centre Frontenac tient à remercier le gouvernement de l'Ontario et les membres du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération de nous avoir donné la possibilité de participer à ce processus de reconstruction, de redécouverte, de renouveau et de reliance auquel nous invitait le premier ministre Bob Rae le 9 décembre 1990.

Créé en 1977, le centre social et culturel Frontenac est un organisme à but non lucratif qui regroupe une vingtaine d'organismes francophones d'ordre social, culturel, scolaire et communautaire.

Comme dans l'histoire de toute société, il est des moments où les générateurs de culture telles les institutions chargées de véhiculer les normes, les valeurs et les conduites sociales doivent s'arrêter pour évaluer les apports multiples en vue d'une meilleure définition de leur avenir. Nous croyons que le Canada, après 124 années d'évolution, est rendu à cette étape importante.

Dans cette démarche, nous sommes certains que l'Ontario peut jouer un rôle actif, notamment dans le rapprochement des différentes communautés culturelles. Certes, l'Ontario possède ses problèmes tout en offrant d'indiscutables avantages car, étant plus diversifié sur le plan culturel et racial que le reste du pays, l'Ontario a toujours été le principal attrait de nouveaux citoyens, ce qui a contribué à l'accroissement de la population ontarienne. Ainsi la présence d'un demi-million de francophones, de nombreux groupes multiculturels et des communautés autochtones place l'Ontario dans une position privilégiée pour promouvoir la bonne entente entre les communautés.

1700

Il faut reconnaître le surcroît des efforts investis tant par la communauté francophone que par le gouvernement de l'Ontario, de manière à ce que les francophones d'ici ne soient pas que des simples spectateurs mais des intervenants, des acteurs dans le développement de la province.

Nous demandons donc que ces efforts soient poursuivis et intensifiés. Pour ce faire, le gouvernement de l'Ontario devrait continuer de faire la promotion de la dualité linguistique dans la province, encourager la création d'institutions socioculturelles, et plus spécifiquement des centres scolaires communautaires qui verraient à assurer le transfert des valeurs, des normes et des conduites sociales à nos enfants.

En conclusion, permettez-nous de vous rappeler que dans tout processus de formation d'une culture, les institutions qu'elles soient jouent un rôle prédominant. Il n'est pas de culture qui puisse nier l'apport de ses institutions, et derrière ces dernières il y a des gens. Il y a aussi ces générations qui année après année ont donné de leur sang, leur vie, en un mot, qui meurent pour faire place à d'autres à la manière des cellules de notre corps. C'est la superposition de ces générations mourant et se renouvelant qui nous permet d'être si fiers de notre culture, laquelle est plus que la somme de tout ce que nous avons fait jusqu'à aujourd'hui. Soyons fiers de notre culture. Aidons nos communautés culturelles à s'épanouir. Investissons dans nos institutions garantes de nos valeurs, normes et conduites sociales. Merci.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for your presentation. Can you expand on what you mean by the schools and community centres? Do you mean them to become cultural centres? And how can we recognize the multicultural aspect of this province? Do you want that entrenched within the Constitution?

M. Toussaint : Est-ce que vous pourriez reformuler s'il vous plaît, parce que je n'ai pas bien suivi.

M. le Président : Il y a la traduction. Peut-être que nos interprètes peuvent répéter la question.

Mr Malkowski: For this committee, what would you like to see included in the Constitution? Can you further expand on what you meant by the schools and the community centres? Do you see them as being cultural centres? Can you further explain how you would see the french community's rights being entrenched as well as the multicultural aspect of the province?

M. Toussaint : Pour ce qui nous concerne en tant que communauté francophone, nous pensons que le principe du centre scolaire communautaire donnerait l'avantage aux groupes francophones de développer, de transmettre la culture à nos enfants. Le centre scolaire communautaire réunirait, comme son nom l'indique, l'aspect scolaire et l'aspect communautaire. Étant donné la tendance à l'intégration ou bien l'assimilation qui est très forte pour nos jeunes francophones, l'enfant qui sort de l'école francophone pourrait continuer les différentes étapes de son éducation à travers une structure francophone, à travers un centre qui pourrait lui permettre d'échanger avec des amis francophones et puis d'aller puiser dans les sources des valeurs, comme je viens de mentionner dans le rapport, des valeurs, des normes et des conduites sociales que je pense seul dans un centre scolaire communautaire on pourrait avoir.

Le problème auquel on fait face présentement est que nos jeunes à Kingston ici n'ont pas de centre communautaire pour le moment. Nous avons le Centre Frontenac, mais qui ne peut pas offrir tous les services à la communauté francophone. Nous sommes obligés d'aller quémander ailleurs différents espaces pour pouvoir présenter des spectacles, pour pouvoir donner des services à la communauté. Nous croyons qu'en ayant un centre scolaire communautaire qui intègre l'aspect scolaire et l'aspect communautaire, il y aurait cette continuité et les enfants, les jeunes franco-

phones n'auraient pas à vraiment se perdre dans l'immensité, les tendances. Ils seraient un peu contrôlés, plus ou moins, par nos valeurs et nos structures tout en se montrant ouverts aux différents aspects culturels de la société. Je pense que nous nous devons de leur donner un centre qui leur permettrait de s'épanouir, de réaliser des activités en français, une chose que nous n'avons pas présentement.

OPTIMIST CLUB
CLUB OPTIMISTE

The Chair: I call next from le Club Optimiste Guy Marois.

Mr Marois: Good afternoon. My presentation will be done in two sections. The first is a personal view, and I will do it in English. The second section, which is the Optimist Club position, will be done in French.

First, in my name and in the name of the Optimist Club, I would like to thank you all for accepting me to come and talk to you.

For a few years now, as I am a native of Quebec, I have realized more and more that the population of Canada is dissatisfied with the federal system we have right now. I am happy to see that Quebec has decided to do something about it. We have to realize that they have problems with the federal system as Ontario has problems with the federal system, as other parts of Canada have problems. I lift my hat to Quebec for wanting to do something about it.

The advantage they have is that they started a while back. I am very happy to see that with this committee we are finally jumping in and working at it. I do not think Quebec really has the intention of breaking up Canada. I see it more as the intention of reorganizing Canada. As with a company that does a reorganization, it does not mean that once it is finished it changes its name. With a house, if you tear down a few walls and add an extension it does not mean the number on the house is going to change.

Therefore, I see it as very important that we work hard to keep Canada and also work hard on our needs here in Ontario. I see Canada as a government that will help each region of Canada. When I talk of "region," I mean the Maritimes, the provinces of the west, Quebec, the first nations and Ontario. Canada must help these people maximize their needs.

For Ontario, as I said before, I am very happy to see that we are finally sitting down and looking at what our needs are, where Ontario fits in all this. It is important for us not to point any fingers at anybody, but to look at ourselves and look at what need, what we expect from this Canada, so that when we sit down with the other provinces, instead of saying, "We don't want you to do this," we can say: "We want this from Canada. This is what we want."

1710

En ce qui concerne le Club Optimiste de Kingston, son principal devoir dans les communautés est d'aider les jeunes, voir à leurs besoins. On a remarqué plusieurs choses depuis un certain temps : on a remarqué des problèmes de drogue ; nous avons remarqué des problèmes des jeunes qui lâchent l'école avant le temps ; nous remar-

quons de plus en plus de familles monoparentales ; nous remarquons de plus en plus de jeunes qui se sentent délaissés, qui sont perdus ; nous remarquons de plus en plus de jeunes qui mangent seulement un repas par jour. Food banks are now very notorious.

Il est important, parce qu'il y a plusieurs choses dont l'Ontario n'a pas le contrôle, que nous nous arrangeons pour être capables de réagir. Nous devons nous équiper d'outils. Le libre-échange entre le Canada et les États-Unis est fait ; ça peut être amélioré mais c'est fait. Nous devons nous adapter. Les jeunes, on a besoin d'eux. Il est important que ni la drogue, ni les problèmes de nourriture, ni les problèmes de logement, ni les problèmes de scolarité deviennent des obstacles pour qu'on soit plus compétitif au niveau international.

De plus, l'Ontario n'est pas en position d'empêcher les États-Unis d'établir un libre-échange avec le Mexique. Nos besoins humains sont importants. Nous devons nous spécialiser, nous devons nous arranger pour que nos jeunes finissent l'école, soient instruits et soient équipés pour pouvoir affronter les besoins de l'Ontario au niveau international et à l'intérieur de leur propre province.

To conclude, from my position and the one of the Optimist Club, we see Canada going in the same direction or having the same needs as the European Community except for one thing. The European Community needs to give more and more responsibilities to a centralized government while we need to do the opposite. We need to give more and more tools to our different people and our different regions so they can satisfy their needs. Thank you.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much. I am familiar with the Optimist Club. The Optimist Club in Nepean is in my riding and I get to interact with these people quite often, and their efforts are very admirable.

You seem to have indicated, as we have heard from several presenters, that Ontario needs to take a leadership role and not just be in a reactive mode to what is going on around us. We learn a lot of what is going on around us through many media presentations in particular. You said we should make some regional representations or focus regionally on certain items. I wonder if you could tell us what items you think we could focus on or deal with regionally better than we are doing now centrally.

Mr Marois: I think it is important that we have a certain control on specifics. For example, when we talk of education, Ontario has needs in workmanship that other provinces do not have, and it is important that Ontario can act very fast and be able to make the changes it needs to adapt as fast as possible.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Is that skills training you are referring to?

Mr Marois: Skills training, that is one example. Another example could be aboriginal rights, or multiculturalism. It is just that every region has a specific need, and the different regions have to have this latitude to be able to adapt themselves. If you want specifics, I do not think I am in the position right now to give you specifics.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: What you have given is very helpful. Thank you.

Mr Marois: But I think what is really important is that we determine those needs and that we get the tools to be able to satisfy them.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Hopefully, forums like this will help us do that.

Mr Marois: I am very happy to see you here.

Ms Churley: Thank you. I think you have an interesting and somewhat different perspective on Quebec than we have heard throughout our travels. Most people I have heard compare Confederation and the country to the family and refer to Quebec as being the delinquent or at least troubled teenager who is going through growing pains and needs to be treated with either kindness or whatever. You seem to be saying, which I think is interesting, that Quebec is more grown up than the rest of us or is ahead of us in some ways and that perhaps it is the rest of us who need to do some growing up. I am wondering if that is, in a way, what you meant.

Mr Marois: When you look at the rhythm with which they are going right now, in certain aspects they are in advance of us. Fifteen years ago they had a political party that had a dream. Now they have two political parties that are coming up with solutions, with things they want to do in this country. To my last knowledge, we do not even have a political party that has a dream right now. I cannot wait to see a political party here in Ontario that will come up with some good ideas and a way of thinking that will send us in one direction.

The only thing I have is that you have to understand that Quebec is being an emotional province, and I would expect it to react faster than anybody else because of that. It is just them, they are emotional. What is dangerous is that I was not too scared 10 or 15 years ago, because, as I said, the political party had a dream but it did not have much to base it on. Now it is a logical plan coming through, and the majority of people out there believe in it and see it as a solution to their problems, while we do not even have a political party that has a dream.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

ST JOSEPH'S SCHOOL

The Chair: Could I call next a group of students from St Joseph's School: Jason Gallagher, Matt Hubbard, Jesse Billett and Chris Tillaart? While they are coming up, could I also acknowledge the presence of a former MPP for Kingston and The Islands, Ken Keyes.

Interjection: He was here.

The Chair: Okay. Go ahead.

Mr Reil: Thank you. I am Robin Reil, the principal of St Joseph's School in Prescott. We are a grades 4-to-8 school with 175 students. What we have here are four grade 7 students in our enriched class. We really appreciate the accessibility of the Ontario government in terms of our being here speaking. We also want to acknowledge the great help we got first of all from our MPP Bob Runciman, who spent an hour with us. We went up to his office; no problem to do that. We also had an hour with our federal MP Jim Jordan, and we thank him for that. It is great to see access to government, as I have mentioned.

1720

The basic assignment the students had was that we kind of said in terms of the approach, "Let's not deal with the way things are, let's talk about things the way they ought to be." Again, we thank you for doing that and I did mention to the students this may be their one chance in lifetime to say, "Hi, mom and dad," but they have not quite decided if they are going to do that yet.

The Chair: Feel free to do that as well.

Mr Gallagher: Hello. My name is Jason Gallagher and I am the first speaker of a group of four students and this report expresses our views on Ontario's role in the Confederation of Canada.

Our opinions are summarized in the form of our mission statement which we hope complies with the feeling of other Canadians on the subject that it deals with. Our hope is to let the committee know the opinions of young Canadians so that our voices may be recognized in the government of our province.

In hearing this report, remember that as young people we are often misinformed as to the facts of Canada's political situations. Please overlook any errors in this report that conflict with fact.

Interjections.

Mr Harnick: We don't get those admissions too often.

Mr Gallagher: We were wondering if each person had one of our briefs.

The Chair: No, I think we only received a few copies but we will make copies for the members of the committee.

Mr Gallagher: Okay.

Ontario, as one of the most economically powerful provinces in the country, has a responsibility to lead Canada in trying to make the ideal a reality. We must try to build a Canada where all Canadians can feel a sense of national pride without resorting to becoming a hyphenated Canadian. Also, we must try to establish a country where bilingualism is respected and both French and English-speaking people have equal language rights.

A country where the aboriginal peoples have national security is necessary so that all citizens of Canada can feel a part of our nation. These people should have more rights that enable them to preserve their culture and heritage in a way that is less restricted than the present state. The aboriginal peoples are the first people of our country and are the most poorly treated. This must end in order to bring unity to Canada.

Another issue that Canada is confronted with is the possibility of the separation of Quebec. Ontario cannot sit back and watch our neighbour simply separate from our country. We must assist in helping Quebec find a happy medium with our government so that we can hold Canada together.

Ontario faces all these issues and more, so we must face them in a way that will meet the rights of all Canadians, so that we can strengthen our unsteady Confederation.

Mr Billett: Hello. My name is Jesse Billett and I will be speaking to you on the issues of bilingualism and aboriginal rights.

Ontario is going through difficult times in terms of conflicts over official bilingualism. The past dispute in Sault Ste Marie triggered other municipalities into making notions to switch to official unilingualism.

In our opinion, this action was quite unnecessary. What's the point in making a row over an issue that is irrelevant in a specific area? Other cities such as Kingston and Brockville decided to ignore the action taken by Sault Ste Marie since bilingualism does not apply in their areas. This makes perfect sense since francophones in Ontario will not live in areas where there are mostly English-speaking people, but rather they will live in French-speaking communities.

Ontario recognizes the bilingual nature of Canada. We also recognize that French-speaking people have the right to services in their own language where numbers warrant.

The francophone minority in Ontario does not rule out bilingualism at all. The public discussion paper released by Premier Rae states that there are 91 francophone newspapers and 19 French theatre companies. This is proof that the French minority in Ontario does not mean that it is in any way insignificant. This means that we must try to work with our French population to try and lessen the friction between French and English people.

One way to gain an advantage from Ontario's—for all intents and purposes—bilingualism is to educate both French- and English-speaking people so they can work together to make a better Ontario and a better Canada.

The French language is an important part of Canada. It is a part of our heritage and must be preserved. The bilingual aspect of our country is what makes it very unique throughout the world. Canada is the only country that is part of the British Commonwealth and the French la francophonie. This makes our country special among other nations of the world.

To conclude this section of our report, we would like to say that we should not fight about our languages but work together to put them to their best possible use to build Canada. It would be nice if Canadians could say: "I speak English, je parle français, I am Canadian, je suis Canadien, and I'm proud."

We are aware that the situation with our native people is bad. Reserves are too small and the condition of the living facilities on these reserves is very poor. We have to listen to our native people's concerns and issues and open our ears to their complaints so we can make a change for the better with our native Canadian people.

This is also an area that we feel that most Canadians, ourselves included, need to be educated and made aware of and made aware of the role of the native peoples in Canada. They were here first and should be considered to have a prominent place with our founding fathers of Confederation.

Mr Hubbard: I am Matthew Hubbard and first I will be speaking to you on our Quebec separation issue.

Our neighbour to the east, Quebec, is demanding certain privileges or powers such as the right to control its own manpower, health, agriculture, communications, regional development, etc.

Ontario can act as a mediator much like the Soviet Union in the Gulf crisis and help Quebec obtain some of these reasonable benefits that it is asking for from Ottawa. Such demands include the right to control its own regional development and unemployment insurance.

We cannot risk losing such a part of Canada so distinct in culture and heritage due to the fact that Quebec has been taking a beating since 1759. We have to try to find a non-separational solution to our problems with Quebec so that we can keep a unified Canada and preserve the unique cultural identity of Canada.

Now I will do our environment issue. In Ontario the environment is a very important issue as many people are becoming increasingly aware of the environment difficulties Canada is facing. The problem is that there are many misinformed conservationists. The pressure put out on fast food restaurants such as McDonald's to start using paper packaging: This will result in the cutting down of thousands of trees that will take years to replace. Fast food packaging is mainly made of styrofoam which is not biodegradable, but does no harm in the environment when it is placed in landfills.

Ontario must educate the general public so that zealous conservationists do not cause more harm than good to the environment.

1730

Mr Tillaart: I am Chris Tillaart and I will be speaking on Ontario and the United States and making the closing statement.

We feel if Quebec separates from Canada we will have lost a distinct culture in our country and we will be more likely to be influenced by the Americans. Also the Canadian aboriginal people are a distinct culture and if they separate because of our constant violations of their rights as humans we will become susceptible to the American way of life and we do not want this.

We should attempt to establish a different culture from the United States. Canada's young people are influenced daily by US television. For instance, many children think that we have a President instead of a Prime Minister. Canada's metric system is ignored and replaced by imperial units in the home. Ontario can help to preserve our cultural identity by emphasizing our heritage and making a province that is distinctly Canadian.

Closing statement: That concludes our report to the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. After reading this report and hearing our presentation, please keep in mind that the writers are young and their opinions are influenced by the media and others around us. Our information is mainly based on research, but some is based on things that we heard on the radio, watched on television or read in newspapers. If any of the material in this report is faulty, it is because we are misinformed and form assumptions that are based on what we do know. Please overlook any such errors and try to derive our meaning from them.

We appreciate the chance to present this report to the committee since we also feel that it is important for the people of Canada to communicate with their government so that Canada will work for everybody.

On behalf of St Joseph's School and its students, we would like to thank the government for letting us speak our minds about this issue. Thank you.

The Chair: We have heard from a number of students in our travels across the province. You are the youngest group of students that we have heard from and we appreciate your coming and talking to us.

Mr Bisson: First of all, with regard to old people and young people alike, I do not think we have a monopoly when it comes to being unfactual. So you did not do any better or any worse than anybody else.

Interjection: I think they did a lot better.

Mr Bisson: I think you did a lot better in some cases, quite honestly. I just have a very simple question. You look at us as adults, as the so-called leaders of our society. What is your assessment as to where things are going and what are some of the things that you see that we need to be able to do in order to get past this impasse that we are in right now—just a general assessment, nothing technical, just how you feel.

Mr Billett: Well, that depends on what issue you are dealing with.

Mr Bisson: We are talking specifically to what we are dealing with within this committee. We are talking about the future role that we should play with regard to the Constitution.

Mr Billett: I cannot hear a word you are saying here.

Mr Bisson: That is quite all right. Most people never do understand me. You are very perceptive, I must say. I will try it again. To be very specific, all I am saying, from where you are sitting in your own experience, looking at what is happening today in Canada with regard to the squabbling that you see French, English, Quebec, anti-Quebec, all of that stuff, what is your—how do you feel about that and how do you think that we as adults are dealing with it?

Mr Billett: Well, in observing from a fly-on-the-wall point of view, we see that if we were to look at it as if we had never been here before—I will quote a number of Australians I met once. They said they were confused about why we could not decide whether or not we wanted to be a country. We can see that Canada, I guess, is going through political turbulence and you might say that the leaders handling it are doing a fairly good job, but it needs to be speeded up and it needs to look at everything on a broader perspective and not just what is at hand right now, but what could be in the future.

Mr Bisson: Very profound.

The Chair: Mr Harnick? Is there a question? No? Okay. Thank you very much, again. Could I also note that we have been joined by Chris Stockwell from the Conservative caucus. Welcome, Mr Stockwell.

FIRST NATIONS TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

The Chair: The next speaker is Bruce Millar from the First Nations Technical Institute.

Mr Millar: I must admit that coming on after such a presentation is certainly not a good act to follow. I hope

my presentation will live up to at least partially to what they have done.

My name is Bruce Millar. I am the president of the First Nations Technical Institute, which is located on the Tyendinaga territory on the shores of the Bay of Quinte just west of here. I have been asked on behalf of Chief Earl Hill of the Mohawks, Bay of Quinte council, to bring greetings and thanks for hearing a representative from the community, and also from Chairman Doug Maracle, the chairman of the board of directors of the First Nations Technical Institute.

Our organization is a post-secondary institute. We operate three wholly owned subsidiary companies that conduct commercial activities related to the learning activities of our parent company. Since the official start of operations in the summer of 1985, the institute has faced and continues to face many barriers. In the limited time available, I cannot give much more than a brief overview, but I want to focus as much as possible on issues relating to learning. Aboriginal people have missed the Industrial Revolution to a large extent and we must not let the aboriginal communities miss the technology revolution.

The first issue that I think needs to be dealt with expeditiously is the business of federal-provincial jurisdiction with respect to aboriginal people. I remember when we were starting the institute, we approached the then Minister of Colleges and Universities, the Honourable Bette Stephenson, and said that we wanted to start a unique training facility on the Tyendinaga reserve for aboriginal people in partnership with the Loyalist College in Belleville.

She thought that was, "A hell of an idea, great stuff and let us know how it goes, but since aboriginal education is a federal responsibility, go and talk to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development." We went and talked to the Honourable John Munro, who thought it was "A hell of an idea and let me know how it goes, but since post-secondary education is a provincial jurisdiction, go and talk to the Minister of Colleges and Universities."

This exclusionary use of the jurisdiction, or the counter-jurisdiction, or overlapping jurisdiction, has caused a lot of trouble. But just about that time, to our rescue came the skills growth fund, an initiative by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission to provide innovative solutions to target groups who were not being well served by the existing college and university system.

This initiative, I think, was funded in the neighbourhood of \$390 million. I could be wrong with that, but there was quite a bit of money in it. In the guide to applicants it indicated that an aboriginal community wanting to start a training facility for its people, especially in areas of high concern or high national interest such as technology, would receive priority. Boy, we thought we were in like Flint.

Well, not so. Immediately the provinces said, "This is an unwarranted federal incursion into provincial jurisdiction." So the government of Canada stood firm and granted the provinces a veto over all projects. To make a long story short, after 24 months of lobbying and with the support, eventually, of both the minister of Indian affairs and the Minister of Colleges and Universities, our project was

denied. Of the \$53 million in the skills growth fund that went to Ontario, to the target groups, women got \$200,000, handicapped people got \$150,000, and aboriginal people did not get anything. So much for being a target group. There is a very cynical statement around Tyendinaga that says, "If we can find an aboriginal woman with a limp, we could probably get every grant in the book," but I am not so sure about that either.

The time has come for both levels of government to accept the challenge of the growing trends towards aboriginal-controlled infrastructure, including education, and use the overlapping jurisdictions as a funding authority to enable innovative programs to continue and to start. Provincial funding to reserve locations must be enabled. At present we still have not had a federal-provincial meeting with respect to on-reserve post-secondary or secondary institutions.

Aboriginal control of aboriginal education and learning systems remains an achievable goal. You do not have to cause duplication of services or double funding. If you look in the book on the sidebar, you see the terrible numbers that we are all overly familiar with now about education of aboriginal people, about the poor social and health care that other speakers today have alluded to.

1740

But in Canada we have another problem that is strictly provincial and federal and again deals with legislation. We have developed a complex, segmented, complicated and frustrating system for defining learning. We have basic adult education. We have literacy. We have skills development. We have training. We have post-secondary, elementary-secondary and a few others that are not going to be mentioned here. All are learning activities, but are administered through a multitude of government authorities. In aboriginal country, this complicates further the jurisdictional and logistics nightmare that must be overcome to meet the needs of the learner.

The funding of results—that is, success—is impeded and the funding of failure perpetuated. The typical client we get—we have a social services program for welfare administrators—is a 45-year-old Cree lady who comes to us with English as a second language, who has been a welfare administrator for 15 years. She needs basic adult education, English language literacy; she needs to be involved in some high school-level programs and she is enrolled in a post-secondary diploma program.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services funds her travel. Indian Affairs, education pays her tuition. Indian Affairs, social development pays some of the cost of the course. Canada Employment and Immigration Commission buys some of the seats, and we have seven separate funding agencies, all with different reporting methods and different funding criteria. It becomes very difficult.

The federal and provincial agreement with respect to the delivery of social services is a good example. What happened was that the province has accepted the responsibility of delivering what is normally a provincial jurisdiction, social services, and then it is billed back through an agreement with the federal government. But at the time it was done, the human resources required to operate the welfare administration delivery system in small, isolated

communities was largely omitted; as a result, many years later we are just now addressing the learning needs of those people who have been welfare administrators in a very difficult environment.

If further programs, such as airports, policing and education, are also to be involved at a federal and provincial co-operative level, this omission must not be overlooked again. Some aboriginal communities are distrustful of further and increased provincial involvement, not because there is not a need for involvement and not because the history of the provincial involvement has been poor. In fact, I would like to give a pat on the back to the native community branch and the ministries of Citizenship and Culture and Communications, which have been far more forthcoming with assistance to communities than a lot of their federal counterparts. But aboriginal communities and aboriginal people sometimes feel that increased provincial involvement will enable the federal government to withdraw from its responsibilities.

Intergovernmental co-operation is presently very poor and interdepartmental co-operation is even poorer. I know it has nothing to do with your provincial organization, but at the federal level the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and the Minister of Employment and Immigration are all supposed to be involved in something called CAEDS, the Canadian aboriginal economic development strategy. CAEDS has been an unmitigated failure and continues to be so because the excuse is being used that the other guy pays for it.

I think it is time for partnerships. An aboriginal employment and training working group put together to assist the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission—which left, surprisingly, aboriginal people out of the labour force development strategy even though they have the highest unemployment rates in Canada—devised five working principles, and I thought some of them were applicable here.

Local control: Aboriginal communities, including urban aboriginal communities, require local control of the decision-making processes that affect them. Learning services and local control of learning services is high.

One of the things I have found in talking to public servants and to members of Parliament and MPPs is that aboriginal people tend to be treated as: What do the Indians want? We found in our programs that local control is a way around this, because what is culturally sensitive to an Iroquoian person may be offensive to a Cree, and what is culturally sensitive to a Cree may offend an Ojibway person, and certainly is very different than what Haida or a Micmac person would want. But if you deal with local geographic areas you have an opportunity to make learning and economic development sensitive to the individual area. The only way to deal with that is to listen and provide local control.

The second thing is delivery method. It is critical that learning programs and services be increasingly managed, operated and conducted through aboriginal controlled institutions and infrastructure. Obviously that is a self-serving statement, as I am from an aboriginal controlled

institution—and I hope there is a Brink's truck outside; small, unmarked bills, please.

What I would like to point out here is that the Ontario government traditionally has addressed aboriginal needs in sensitizing the existing college and university system to cultural aspects and the kind of learning needs of the aboriginal people. I think that is good work and it must continue, but it is only part of the answer. Having a place that is run and controlled and organized and sensitized and directly responsible to the client group is part of the answer as well, and we hope that increased funding and increased consideration for aboriginal controlled organizations will be given by the provincial and federal governments.

The funding mechanism: It is important that funding mechanisms be developed which recognize the planning, operational and capital needs of aboriginal learning institutions. With the community college system in Ontario, the buildings were built and equipped initially—initial startup grants were provided to the board of directors. In aboriginal country, there is no capital structure.

The Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte—through Chief Hill, who says he is too stupid to quit, but I would not accept that; I think he is a very persevering man and has great vision—have struggled on using winter works capital grants. Our first buildings were six portable classrooms dragged from Nicholson Catholic College, put up on a full basement and completely renovated at a cost of less than \$15 a square foot to provide us with our initial home. But we have found that an unbelievable difficulty in meeting the specific criteria of contribution agreements; a lack of flexibility and a lack of understanding of local needs has hampered us. We know that when the transfer payments come from the federal government to the province for education all noses are counted, including aboriginal, so the position that the provincial government has little or no responsibility for aboriginal post-secondary education on reserve is really quite a difficult one to defend.

The Chair: Mr Millar, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Millar: Okay. I have one more. Access to learning and supportable results: Learning services to aboriginal clientele must provide access, supportive learning environments and delivery methods that produce supportable results. What I am saying here is that exclusionary criteria for people who want to participate in learning, such as aboriginal people, must be removed as quickly as possible. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. We are going to have to move on to the next presenter. Thank you, sir.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO DES MILLE-ÎLES

The Chair: The next organization we are going to hear from is l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario des Mille-Îles. We do not have a name of a person.

M. Bordeleau : Je me présente : Claude Bordeleau, président de l'ACFO Mille-Îles, l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario.

J'aimerais remercier le président du comité ainsi que ses membres de nous avoir accordé le privilège de nous présenter ici aujourd'hui et de vous adresser la parole. Je pense qu'il est

intéressant de noter que, si on n'était pas rendu au point où on en est maintenant, on n'aurait peut-être pas le privilège de s'adresser en français comme on peut le faire. On espère quand même reconnaissant des efforts que le comité a déployés pour assurer que partout en région, les gens puissent s'exprimer selon leur désir dans leur langue maternelle.

J'en profiterai aujourd'hui pour vous faire part du point de vue global de l'ACFO comme tel, et plus particulièrement de notre vécu quotidien dans cette région de l'Est ontarien. Je vais essayer de garder mes remarques brèves étant donné que nous sommes un peu en retard sur l'horaire et que nous devons continuer avec les présentations. J'aimerais quand même vous situer géographiquement sur ce que représente l'ACFO Mille-Îles.

Cette région s'étend du village de Cardinal à son extrémité est jusqu'à Trenton à l'ouest sur une distance de plus de 200 kilomètres le long de l'autoroute, nommément l'autoroute Macdonald-Cartier. Cette région comprend cinq comtés, les comtés de Leeds-Grenville, Frontenac, Hastings, Prince Edward et aussi Lennox et Addington. C'est un vaste territoire qui recouvre plus de 17 000 kilomètres carrés. Un point de comparaison que j'aime utiliser est que ça représente approximativement le territoire actuel du Koweït, mais un cinquième seulement de sa population. Par ailleurs, si on utilise les données du recensement de 1986 et les projections démographiques telles que données par le ministère du Trésor et de l'Économie de l'Ontario, on constate qu'il y a près de 10 000 francophones dans la région de l'ACFO Mille Îles dont 4 000 habitent la région immédiate de Kingston.

1750

C'est une région qui est idéalement située à égale distance entre Ottawa, Montréal et Toronto. C'est d'ailleurs un peu cette situation géographique qui avait été attrayante il y a plus de 300 ans lorsque le comté de Frontenac était venu créer le premier fort, Cataracoui, en ces lieux mêmes en 1673.

J'aimerais maintenant que vous vous déplaciez quelque peu dans le temps et dans l'espace pour nous situer à Toronto, plus précisément au parc de la Reine, à l'ouverture de la première session de la 35^e législature de l'Ontario. Certains d'entre vous, j'imagine que la plupart d'entre vous étaient là. Le nouveau gouvernement qui dirige cette législature avait alors indiqué par le biais de son discours du trône sa ferme intention d'être, et je cite, «à l'écoute de la population» et de ne ménager «aucun effort pour répondre à ses besoins». Selon moi, il est important de voir plus loin que ses propres paroles dans le texte. On peut voir que plus loin dans le discours, on parle du rôle de l'Ontario et comment il peut être important dans le Canada renouvelé. Sa contribution au débat national passe d'abord par une redéfinition de ce que l'Ontario entend être pour ses propres citoyens. On peut lire dans le texte, et je cite de nouveau, que l'Ontario doit se donner «un idéal selon lequel tous peuvent vivre avec dignité... bâtir une société où tous les membres auront véritablement accès à l'éducation... et seront traités de façon équitable».

Il faut bien noter que le texte ne dit pas que tu auras droit à une éducation de qualité à condition d'être anglo-

phone ; cela ne dit pas non plus qu'on reconnaît le principe de la justice pourvu que tu résides à Toronto ou à Ottawa. On parle en fait de tous les membres, peu importe où ils se trouvent. Les francophones de cette région font partie de cette société et entendent bien y contribuer activement. Ils ont besoin cependant que l'on reconnaisse leurs besoins spécifiques afin qu'ils puissent eux-mêmes développer les outils nécessaires à leur épanouissement.

Les trois communautés nationales qui sont les autochtones, les francophones et les anglophones ont droit à une éducation dans leur langue maternelle respective du début jusqu'à la fin. Si l'on se reporte à quelques années dans le temps, en 1984 la province de l'Ontario avait reconnu le droit à l'éducation à tous les citoyens peu importe leur nombre. En pratique, cependant, cela se traduit à une offre de classes de langue française différente selon les régions. Présentement il y a un groupe de parents dans la région de Brockville qui tente d'implanter des classes de langue française, et le seul choix qu'on leur offre est de suivre ces cours soit à Cornwall soit à Ottawa, ce qui nécessite un déplacement de plus d'une heure et demie en autobus. Un peu plus tôt il y avait également eu un autre conseil scolaire qui offrait même de transporter ses élèves jusqu'à une distance de 400 kilomètres afin de leur offrir un service de langue française.

Sur un autre plan, ici, même dans notre localité, nous avons les résidents de la base militaire de Kingston qui n'ont pas encore eu de confirmation si oui ou non ils auront le droit de vote aux prochaines élections municipales qui se tiendront en novembre prochain, et pourtant on est rendu en mars. On demande également à ce qu'il y ait des gestions qui se feront par les francophones dans les régions de Belleville et Trenton afin qu'eux-mêmes puissent avoir le droit de décider à quel type d'éducation ils ont droit. On se doit également de reconnaître une spécificité au niveau des garderies francophones, puisque maintenant les monnaies qui sont attribuées à ce niveau ne font aucunement mention de l'état de la langue maternelle. On se trouve pénalisé à ce niveau.

Au niveau d'éducation, globalement les subventions devraient être attribuées non pas par le nombre d'étudiants mais en fonction des programmes à offrir, puisque ce n'est qu'à ce prix que l'on pourra obtenir un financement équitable.

Dans le discours du trône on mentionnait également qu'il fallait travailler en étroite collaboration avec la communauté francophone afin de préserver ses droits. C'est un objectif noble mais qui ne tient pas compte de toute la réalité. Il faut dépasser cette préservation des droits ; il faut en fait en avoir une offre active. Les droits linguistiques, puisqu'il faut en parler, devraient être reconnus par la province. C'est un symbole nécessaire auquel on se réfère souvent et qui permettrait à l'Ontario d'avoir une image de marque au niveau national ainsi qu'au niveau international. On se doit d'adopter une attitude généreuse qui éviterait les revendications constantes et les litiges coûteux en différents endroits de la province. Ce n'est pas à coups de procès qu'on doit avancer dans la législation mais bien par une offre généreuse.

On se doit également d'adopter une attitude qui soit indépendante de ce qui se passe dans la province voisine.

Cela nécessite d'être sensible à notre réalité francophone. Pour donner quelques exemples de ceci, il ne suffirait pas de traduire le texte anglais de toute l'histoire de l'Ontario pour réussir à voir la réalité francophone de son histoire et de sa contribution francophone.

En terminant, j'aimerais apporter quelques recommandations spécifiques et d'ordre général. On parle souvent en Ontario de régions désignées, mais lorsqu'on parle de régions désignées, cela veut nécessairement dire qu'on parle de régions non désignées et le nombre de francophones qui se retrouvent dans ces régions, dont Kingston, se chiffre à plus de 90 000. Cela crée des distinctions inutiles qui en fait créent des citoyens de deuxième classe dans ces endroits.

En deuxième lieu, la chaîne française de TVOntario est présentement accessible uniquement à environ deux tiers de sa population, ce qui laisse plus du tiers, dont environ 180 000 francophones, avec aucun moyen d'accès à la télévision éducative en Ontario. Il serait absolument crucial et indispensable que l'Ontario débourse dès maintenant l'argent nécessaire pour assurer qu'il y a des retransmetteurs dans toutes les régions afin que toute une génération de francophones puisse être desservie, et non pas être complètement oubliée pendant qu'elle sera à l'école.

La participation de l'Ontario au niveau des programmes de langue officielle doit se faire et doit être entendue au niveau fédéral. Des ententes spécifiques devront être créées entre la province et le gouvernement fédéral afin que des fonds spéciaux soient attribués pour la création de centres scolaires communautaires. À ce niveau l'Ontario, par le biais de son ministère de l'Éducation, a un rôle important à jouer puisque ce n'est que par ce ministère que l'on pourra obtenir ces fonds, et présentement en province il y a déjà plusieurs centres scolaires communautaires qui sont à l'étude. Le groupe de Kingston a déjà déposé un premier rapport qui sera distribué aux différents ministères, et on espère qu'avec ceci nous pourrions avoir accès à une gamme complète de services et d'éducation en langue française. Mais cela passe au départ par une demande que la province doit faire au niveau fédéral.

La constitution est un sujet qui tient le débat présentement. On se demande quel est le rôle que l'Ontario peut y apporter. Je pense qu'une des contributions importantes qu'on pourrait y faire serait dans la définition d'une formule d'amendements qui aiderait à renouveler les différents aspects de cette constitution.

J'aimerais terminer par un extrait de discours qui a été présenté il y a de cela plus de 80 années par le premier président de l'ACFO qui est, je crois, encore de mise aujourd'hui :

«Il nous semble également évident que [l'idéal de justice] ne sera pas atteint, en Ontario, aussi longtemps que les [francophones] n'y auront pas à leur disposition l'usage complet du moyen le plus efficace et le plus propre à leur formation intellectuelle, morale et sociale, qui est... celui de la langue maternelle.

«La langue française, comme les traditions françaises, font partie de l'héritage national du Canada. Je suis convaincu que la majorité de nos compatriotes de langue anglaise ne désire pas l'oubli ou la méconnaissance de ces glorieuses traditions, ni la disparition de notre langue maternelle. Et si

les [francophones] comprennent... qu'il [leur] incombe de continuer à faire un élan historique pour maintenir la langue française, n'ont-ils pas raison d'espérer et de croire que leurs concitoyens de langue anglaise leur aideront à conserver une si belle partie de l'héritage national ?»

Ces paroles sont tirées du texte qui a été prononcé le 19 janvier 1910 à l'occasion de la première réunion de l'Association canadienne-française d'éducation de l'Ontario, comme on l'appelait à l'époque, prononcé par le sénateur Napoléon Antoine Belcourt.

Je tenais à réutiliser ces mêmes paroles pour démontrer encore une fois que ce dont on discute aujourd'hui est en fait une répétition souvent de ce qui s'est produit, et qu'il est temps que l'on passe aux actions afin de non simplement être d'accord avec les principes, mais également de trouver les moyens nécessaires pour fournir la structure et tout ce qui est bon pour adopter en Ontario français les lois et la législation pour respecter les droits acquis en francophonie. Je vous remercie.

1800

HELEN COOPER

The Chair: Could I call next the mayor of Kingston, Mayor Helen Cooper.

Mrs Cooper: Hello. Good evening, everyone. I think it is evening by now and I welcome you to Kingston city hall. I hope you enjoy the experience of listening to us in the surroundings in which you sit. I could not help but recall while I was listening as well that almost 150 years ago, in fact in June 1841, the Confederation of Upper Canada and Lower Canada was officially launched on the steps of what is now the old front entrance of the Kingston General Hospital. So the issues of which you are learning today are very much a part of the history of this community, and this city hall in which you sit—the construction was started on this building in that very same year.

Approximately one year ago the council of the city of Kingston consciously chose to counteract the force of unilingualism which was touching many of our neighbouring municipalities. One entire council meeting was devoted to delegations pleading that Kingston not declare itself unilingual. There were indeed eloquent speakers then, as I am sure there are today, stressing the importance of unity and of linguistic and cultural understanding.

Now, I have not prepared at great length and in depth for this. I know many of you have come from the realm of municipal politics yourself. You know that it is a life of little preparation time, but I originally had the word "tolerance" in there and I scratched it out and wrote the word "understanding." I find the word "tolerance" really quite sounding like we are all martyrs, that we somehow have to put up with something with a kind of suffering smile on our faces while we do it, so I consciously try to avoid the use of that word.

I will stress, however, before we give too many gold stars to the city of Kingston that this motion was that we not support unilingualism. It was not a motion saying we would support bilingualism, although it was translated as that in several reports by the media, including the CBC. There is quite a difference.

Certainly this city was not prepared to support bilingualism because we well recognize that there would be certain very substantive commitments with that which would have financial obligations which we simply were not prepared to meet. Although municipalities, as I am sure you are all aware, are extremely wary of their current financial relationships with the province of Ontario and although the issue of economics was launched as a reason for the wave of unilingualism, I would argue that it was something far more visceral and that the argument of economics came later.

I cannot speak for the people of my community, and I trust there are spokespeople here today who will be able to. So much of this, I think, is very, very personal.

My mother's family—I have ancestors who settled in Quebec City in the late 1700s from Scotland and they lived and worked in the Quebec City area for many, many generations. I have still many relatives in that area. They retain anglophone and Scottish and English traditions. They are all bilingual and they to a certain extent have assimilated and they have no desire to leave Quebec. However, I have met in this community many people of similar origins who have consciously chosen to leave the province and who have a very different feeling towards Quebec than I personally have, so I cannot possibly speak for them because I do not understand the well from which this emotion springs. But I think it is extremely serious and it is extremely worrying, because I think it is terribly destructive for all of us.

What happened, which is a good thing, I think, out of the unilingual debates last year was the development of the forum of eastern Ontario mayors, reeves and wardens. This had been tried to be started once before and never got going, but this problem last year provided a sufficient incentive to be able to get that going and we are now meeting every few months. Of course, as has been explained to you already by the population characteristics of eastern Ontario, we are meeting as anglophone and francophone together and we do have bilingual agendas as well and I trust that out of that there is an ability for people to come and talk to each other eyeball to eyeball over some of these issues in a way that some of us at the local government level in Ontario have never done before.

The other initiative that I would briefly like to mention is the fact that in the last year we have started in Kingston the mayor's committee on race, ethnic and aboriginal relations. It has not been going very long, but there is a very conscious desire here to ensure that this is not just an exercise in window dressing. We have been very fortunate in being able to attract people who have never had anything to do with city hall or any of its committees before and who, when they first started, expressed those very healthy feelings of resentment towards local government, which again I am sure you have heard expressed towards provincial governments as well.

Queen's University is an extremely important resource in this exercise. Not only is there, of course, an intellectual debate at the university, but there is a range of ages there from young to old who are interested in these topics. In fact, the only issue in my experience of kicking around

ere for the last 12 years that Queen's University students have really been very concerned about and appear in delegation about is the issue of the unilingualism debate. But also, our committee on race, ethnic and aboriginal relations has some tremendous resources as a result of having that university here.

I would like to talk to you just very briefly about a totally different tack that I would like to take. Again, this is just a very personal comment, personal observation, and it springs not only from my involvement in local government here in Kingston for the last few years but also from my deep involvement with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario over a period of several years. I think there is a problem in Ontario. I think we can talk about relations between Quebec and other provinces in Canada, especially the province of Ontario, but I think we have to talk about relations within Ontario.

I would suggest to you, as you are sitting at Queen's Park, that there is a growing feeling that Ontario, what is Ontario, is becoming rapidly synonymous with the greater Toronto area. I would suggest to you that citizens outside of the greater Toronto area are feeling an increasing alienation towards Queen's Park and I would suggest that they are also feeling an increasing resentment that most other Canadians regard Toronto and Ontario as synonymous and what comes out of Toronto speaks for all of Ontario.

1810

There is a big, big problem, because the greater Toronto area has certain very definitive characteristics that could well be recognized as serious problems with which you have to deal, but they are not the same characteristics that are shared by the rest of the province. I am speaking about population characteristics. I am speaking about disparities in wealth, which are very different. There are certainly problems here, I do not mean to say there are not, but they are different, and I am also speaking about the fact that all national media focus occurs out of Toronto.

Is this alienation inevitable? Should there be on your part as the legislators at Queen's Park a much more conscious attempt towards decentralization and devolution of certain decision-making in this province? Should there be certain decisions made about transportation systems? Should there be certain decisions made about actual, physical location of government buildings? I do not know. I am just throwing out a few very obvious ideas, but I am sure it is a complex problem.

In all of this, I suggest that it is feasible over the next few years that Ontarians will be asking qualitatively for some of those things from Queen's Park which Quebeckers are now seeking from Ottawa. I will finish at that. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much. There was, I think, at least one question. Mr Offer,

Mr Offer: Thank you very much, Your Worship, and thank you for your presentation.

As we have gone through the province, on more than one occasion people have come before the committee and talked to us in terms of the municipal government being closest to them, and they hold that very dear to them. We

have also heard presentations from associations, from professors, from the legal profession, from people, as we have seen today, students, just coming and talking about the way they feel the role of the province should be, what they feel their vision is of this country.

I am wondering if you feel there is a role for the municipalities to share their thoughts in a leadership type of role, either municipally, on an individual basis, or through the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, to say, "This is an issue which can very directly impact on the operation of municipalities." Those thoughts and comments of municipalities are crucially important in this discussion and whether you feel there is a role—I personally do feel this—but whether this is a matter which can be taken up by AMO or by individual municipalities.

Mrs Cooper: We would love to. I was specifically trying not to refer to municipal governments. I was referring to individuals as I sensed just from the world I live in and the comments I hear. The feelings of alienation that I am attempting just to gloss over here are certainly felt by municipal governments, of that there is no doubt, but I guess I did not want to appear too self-serving here. I think one has to be very careful about this discussion about grass-roots politics, the level closest to the people and so on. This is all very true, of course. Again, many of you who have had a career in local government previous to entering provincial politics know that you live on the street and you are living 24 hours a day with your electorate.

I had a couple of interesting experiences in terms of consultation exercises, and the same public I think will tell you that it views local government as appropriate for certain functions but not for others. In other words, would we please get on with filling the potholes, or preferably digging up the whole road and relaying it, and not worry about getting involved in a lot of the other issues that apparently we are getting involved in, whether we asked for it or not. So therefore I think that there desperately needs to be in this exercise a rationalization of responsibilities at different levels of government.

I will say from the local level as well that one of the biggest problems, of course, is that local government, AMO in particular, is largely regarded as a lobby organization, and that is frustrating because local government is not a special interest group. I think this is a mindset that we all have to get over, particularly as we wrestle with this terrible problem about who is financially and administratively responsible for a huge variety of services. So there is still a feeling among municipal politicians that somehow they are being told to get on with a lot of things without having been consulted first about the appropriateness of whether they should even be involved in the exercise in the first place.

Between municipal government in Ontario and provincial government in Ontario there are big problems, but again, as I said, I was trying not to be too self-serving as a municipal politician in this exercise and point out to you that I think there is also a perception—there certainly is in this community—that somehow whatever rules apply to serve the problems of the greater Toronto area—that could be everything from provision of affordable rental housing

to waste management—somehow the rules are different in Toronto from the rest of the province and somehow there is an advantage to being in Toronto because there is an understanding of Toronto problems in a way there is not an understanding of anybody else's problems, and it seems to us, in all deference to our local members of provincial Parliament who are sitting here, that somehow they get scooped up into this because they end up in Toronto dealing with those who are able to lobby in Toronto.

Mr Offer: Thank you.

The Chair: Gary Wilson, very briefly, please.

Mr G. Wilson: I was hoping that my colleagues here could have responded to that, Mayor Cooper, by saying that this is the first time they have heard that particular concern. Anyway, I just have a short question. I want to salute you for the work you have done in setting up those two committees you mentioned. I was wondering whether you feel there has been a lessening of tension or a decline in the emotion that the language issue was dealt with in the recent past.

Mrs Cooper: As you are well aware, the level of tension in this community last year at this time was extremely high, and it is not like that now in terms of, you know, voluntary expressions that I would hear as mayor in the way that I heard a year ago. But I think it would be naive of us all to assume that anything has changed. I think we have a very split community. As I said, I think there are very visceral, deep reasons for this that I do not understand, so I do not propose at any any point to come and sit here before you and try to tell you what the solution to this problem is, because I do not understand the problem in the first place.

As I tried to explain, my personal experience is so vastly different in this regard that my feelings towards particularly the province of Quebec are very strong feelings that are very different from those which have been expressed to me by some people in this community. I will point out too that as a child growing up in Kingston, my mother tried desperately to get me to learn French, but I was not sufficiently motivated. In that regard, as in all other things, I should have listened to my mother and I did not.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mrs Cooper: Okay. Thank you very much.

KINGSTON COLLEGIATE AND VOCATIONAL INSTITUTE

The Chair: Could I invite next, from Kingston Collegiate and Vocational Institute, a group of students and Bob Williams, teacher. I will just indicate while they are setting up for those people who may be following our meeting over the parliamentary network in the Kingston area, we will be late in beginning the evening session. If people are planning to come to that, we probably will not get that started until at least 7:15, perhaps even closer to 7:30. Go ahead.

Ms Boland: My name is Andrea.

Ms Molson: My name is Ann.

Ms Brown: I am Sarah.

Mr Marans: I am Josh.

Ms Boland: Okay. We do not really have any sort of formal speech prepared, or formal points, because you guys have had a rough day.

Ms Molson: We can tell.

Mr Harnick: You are right. Does it look that obvious?

Ms Boland: Yes, it is quite—yes. We just sort of wanted to have, you know, an informal—like, we are all sort of going to just improvise on each other's points—

Ms Brown: Yes, just talk.

Ms Boland: —and we would really like it if at any point you guys could just butt in and say what you have to say.

Ms Brown: Yes, or even just ask for clarification, or any questions.

The Chair: We will allow that, but after you are finished, okay?

Ms Boland: Oh, really? That is too bad.

The Chair: It is easy enough to try to control them with the rules that we use.

Mr Harnick: You're so conservative, Tony. You usually don't butt in.

Ms Brown: Yes. Come on. No, seriously. If you have something to say, it would just enhance the discussion if we would have an open—instead of us lecturing you.

The Chair: We will allow some flexibility in that. You go ahead with your presentation.

Ms Boland: All right. I guess to start, we are not really representing our school, KCVI. We are representing ourselves. So these are all our views, but they are also views shared by many people our age.

I guess one of our main points and what we found as a bit of an obstacle in coming here and talking about issues concerning Ontario was that in general, as youth, we feel disconnected and alienated and distant from the government or the government processes. We feel really alienated and it is really hard, because of this distance, for us to form an opinion about things like the GST and Meech Lake and Quebec separating. It is really hard because we do not really feel that we can relate with government policies and the way the government goes about doing things, you know?

Ms Molson: I think a lot of people just really feel that the government, in the way things are decided in this country, is just going to take its course really regardless of what we feel as individuals.

Ms Brown: We do not feel that we can make any difference in any decision regarding anything. Even if we write, we go to Parliament Hill and lobby or whatever, we do not feel that we can make a difference, because it ultimately is in your hands.

Ms Boland: Yes. This sort of really I guess reflects a lack of trust and a lack of ability for us to relate to you people. I mean, even the way—

Ms Molson: Even the way this is set up.

Ms Boland: The way this is set up, it is really hard for us to relate to you one on one. Maybe as sort of a bit of a point as youth we could give you is that maybe the government should have a more humanistic aspect to it, you

now, have more of a one-on-one, because it is really hard. Even just if you look at this room now, it is really hard to relate to you people and it makes us feel a little bit intimidated by you.

Ms Y. O'Neill: Have you gone to your MPP's office, to Mr Wilson's office?

Ms Boland: Well, I think we forgot about the municipal level, but I guess we are also talking about the federal level. You have a good point. At the municipal level, I guess we could have more—but even then it is difficult for you.

Mr Bisson: How much of that is perception and how much is reality in that attitude?

Ms Brown: I think a lot of it is perception, because what we see on the TV, I guess basically the TV, like media, what media present to us—

Ms Molson: But I think the really sad thing about what we are talking about is it really leads to a lot of young people not even caring. I mean, the fact of whether we have control or not really aside, I think a lot of people—I do not have that clear an understanding of what the Meech Lake accord is all about, and really because I have not, I feel like it has no bearing on me. I realize that is wrong, but I think—

1820

Mr Harnick: What motivated you to come here today?

Ms Brown: What motivated me in particular—I cannot speak for the others—was that this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. I will never have the opportunity to speak to you guys again. Yes, we do have a few points, a few things that we would like to talk about. You know, we cannot speak to you in formal discussion manners, because it is just not us. But this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, and I am grateful that I can come here and I also appreciate the fact that you guys are listening, you know. So we are going to say what we are able to say.

Mr Offer: But this is not a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. On this issue today it is, but there can be an issue that drives you tomorrow, and there is no barrier that says that you cannot do it tomorrow.

Ms Brown: But within our age group there is a sort of sense of apathy regarding the government. We do not care what you do, because you are going to do it anyway. That is the feeling that we have.

Mr Offer: What do we do to get rid of that barrier? What do you think we should do to reduce that?

Ms Molson: Well, I think stuff like this helps. Like, I think this is a good start.

Ms Boland: This is good and makes it more humanistic.

Mr Harnick: What about the idea, though, when you get to be voting age, you have the opportunity then, if you do not like what we are doing, to vote for somebody else and to work for somebody else and find somebody else to be your candidate who is going to do the things that you think should be done?

Mr Marans: But the thing is, though—

Mr Offer: You would have to bring that point up.

Mr Harnick: You feel guilty, don't you?

Mr Marans: The thing is, though, the people we vote for eventually have to vote by the party line for the most part, don't you? We are not suggesting here that we want a direct democracy, but we do not feel that that is representative. We think that some major decisions, or at least I do, should be left to us.

Mr Bisson: On the question of perception, what happens is that many people do not realize that everybody who is sitting here within our Legislature of Ontario is the same as you. We got involved in politics because we are concerned as well as you are. What I am wondering is how much of that is perception. The attitude in regard to—not to say that everything that politicians do is right because you cannot do everything to please everybody.

Ms Brown: We are not saying that everything you do is wrong either.

Mr Bisson: But the thing is that you as individuals have control because the process is that you can get involved, and that is how we came here.

Ms Boland: As we were talking earlier, one of our points was that we do not really feel that we should have to join a major political party in order to feel that our voice is heard. Why is it that you have to be totally involved with the government in order to be heard?

Mr Beer: You don't.

Ms Boland: You don't? Well, I personally—

The Chair: Let me ask Mr Malkowski to jump in because he has been patiently trying to play it by the rules.

Mr Malkowski: Can you tell me what you think of Canadian unity and how you think the youth in Canada can get involved and what you want to seek for Canada?

Ms Boland: Okay, well personally, about Quebec: From what I can interpret from the news, they are economically strong enough; they are independent; they have got enough natural resources; they are a strong province and they are strong enough to survive as independent from Canada. But I keep wishing, just because you are strong enough to separate from Canada, why do you have to? I have lived half my life in Quebec. I love that place. That place has made me part of who I am. Although I am just as happy living in Ontario, I do not want them to separate.

Ms Molson: Because it enriches our country. What makes Quebec special is beneficial to everyone in Canada.

Mr Marans: If Quebec separates, it is giving up on the problem. It is not a solution, it is a step backwards.

Ms Boland: Like, why should they separate? Just because they are strong enough does not mean that that is a reason to separate. In my view, part of what makes Canada is the fact that we have Quebec. I mean, it is so unique throughout the world that we have this French-speaking province.

Mr Malkowski: Just to add to that, maybe Ontario and Quebec should start having more exchange programs within the high schools. If that was implemented, do you think that it may help in understanding the political process and the whole situation with Quebec?

Ms Molson: I think that would definitely be beneficial because if more people had some kind of contact with Quebec and their culture, then they would see the benefits. They would realize that it enriches Ontario and the rest of Canada.

Ms Churley: I heard you talk about how to get your voices heard and I am just wondering what you think about minorities and the fact that a lot of people are saying, "We want referenda and we want things done by majority rule." How do we hear everybody's voices then? How do we, as politicians, play fair, because we cannot please everybody and we have to protect minorities. What are your views on that?

Mr Marans: We recognize that very often politicians are placed in the position where the best thing for us is not necessarily the thing that is going to be popular, so it makes it difficult to make good decisions. We would not want to see referenda on a constant basis. We do feel, though, that you need to have referenda now and again. Major decisions, and I think it is obvious what they are when they occur, need to have a referendum. There is no point in having you people if we are going to have referenda every day obviously, so we have to place our trust in you to an extent. But you also have to turn to us when you are not sure of the answers, not sure how we feel.

Ms Boland: Also, you know, if Quebec did separate, then other minorities—I am not too sure exactly, you know, what minorities—but I am sure they would all be saying: "We want recognition. We want special status. We want to be recognized by Canada." You cannot please everybody, I am well aware of that, but when the situation is to a point where it is infringing on the rights as a sort of culture within Canada, then I think something should be done. I do not know what can be done. I do not know what can be done, but if the laws here in Canada are infringing on rights to any minority, then I think they should be changed. Whatever steps it takes to do that, then I think they should be taken.

1830

Mr G. Wilson: I just want to ask whether you ever have any school issues that force you into the role of politician. For instance, are any of you on the school—

Ms Brown: I am on the school government.

Mr Bisson: Aha, a politician.

Mr G. Wilson: Exactly. I mean politics occur at all levels. Going back to Mayor Cooper's statement about the understanding, understanding comes from being involved in issues, of course, and it can be at several different levels. I think even what the Quebecois are going through can be felt or empathized with through activities that you are involved in, the stresses and strains that arise in those things. So at least you are on the school council. Are none of the others of you—

Mr Marans: I was on it earlier this year.

Ms Boland: I have been in clubs at schools in the past. I mean, I know you cannot please everybody, and no matter where you go, you are going to see little subforms of governments and people. There comes a point where you have to make a decision and you are not going to be

able to please everybody, but it just seems to me that there are so many things that we could do to improve Canada and from what I see, we are not really doing them.

Ms Brown: I think perhaps maybe if the public, the common person saw that the government actually was trying—and maybe they are but we do not see that. We want to see that. We want to see that you are trying to please us or to help us to understand what your position is, but it is like the government places this border between itself and the common person. As soon as they get in that position of power, we no longer hear from them. We just hear six months later when they have passed a bill and we have to live with it. That is the only time we ever hear from the government.

Mr G. Wilson: I think it is a good first step that you come out and tell us that.

Ms Boland: Things like what is happening right now are really good. I am really pleased I have had the opportunity to speak to you. I would also like to just point out, you know, I am not putting you down as politicians. It is not you personally. I think there is a lot of inhibition about being face to face with any sort of government, anything with a government label on it. I guess people's defences get up and it is like, "This is our opportunity to tell them how we feel." We do not want you to take it personally. We are just—

The Chair: Oh no. We have heard a lot tougher things than this.

Ms Boland: Very good.

The Chair: These are compliments. Mr Winninger, Mrs O'Neill, and then I want to give you an opportunity to add any other points that you may have.

Mr Winninger: Just to build on what Gary and others have said, I know when I was growing up and in high school in London, we formed what we called a political debating society and we had different parties. I was the only one reckless enough back then to join the NDP, but it gave us a chance to explore issues, see different points of view, different perspectives. We were dealing with the same issues back then like medicare and pension plans that the government was dealing with and we felt perhaps more enfranchised that way, by forming a political society and arguing the issues. That is just one idea in case you do not have it already.

Ms Y. O'Neill: I hope you have found this a good experience. I doubt very much this will be once in a lifetime. You may not be able to identify with this, but I made my first presentation to a parliamentary committee in 1958, the first year I taught high school, and I certainly got kind of hooked, it looks like. I really do feel that you have performed a real service to yourselves today and to young people.

I have been in Parliament now for close to four years. I have literally seen hundreds of people in my constituency office, and I think only four of them came in and said: "You are my MPP. I want to introduce myself to you and I would like to get to know you." That is why I asked you the question when I first did. I think that is one thing you can do. You do not need to belong to a political party to do

nat. I think it is the only responsible thing to do as a citizen: to know who is representing you and to give them a chance to explain themselves, to tell them a little about yourself, just to see the environment in which they work.

I thank you very much for doing what you have done today. I am sure you have been an example to lots of people out there who are watching us.

Ms Brown: I think that there has been sort of apathy on both sides, maybe the government not wanting to get off its pedestal per se and the common people not wanting to get out of their couch basically. I think that it basically has to be a two-way street. I do not know who is the first to start but maybe it should be the government. They are the people who have the most power within the society.

Ms Boland: Also it just angers me a little bit that we have to make such an effort to make, you know, government issues more humanistic. Like, why is it that we have to get out of our couch? Why can't we just change the way the whole government works? I am not saying to abolish the government or anything. I just think that you know it should be more one to one, person to person. I know it is hard. There are so many in Canada you cannot speak to each and every one of them, but there must be things you can do to make the people feel more in touch with you.

Ms Molson: Yes, in tune with what is going on.

Ms Boland: Yes.

Mr Beer: But I think you are raising here an interesting question. I am struck by the previous speaker who talked about us having the power. Especially those of us who are Liberals could argue that on 6 September we did not have the power. It rested out there, which is where it ought to be. So when you talk about you know who should be coming to whom surely it is a circular process.

Maybe one of the things that we have forgotten is, each of us as an individual, as an elector, as a member of our society, what are our responsibilities to make sure that our democratic system works? Now, ours, especially once elected, is not to forget who elected us, where we come from, what our responsibilities are as individual elected members. But it seems to me, whether I am elected or I am sitting where you are, that as a citizen I have responsibilities around the issues—I mean to my family, to my own community, however defined—and that it is only that way where both of us work at it.

There is no question that all of us have seen this sense of alienation, not just among secondary school students but among a wide range of people in society. We either are going to find a solution to that or we are not going to find the kind of solution we want for our country. So I would say that it goes back to the simple proposition that Dave Wininger made to you, that there are many, many different ways whereby we become involved. I think that we have to say as individuals, "Yes, I have got to get out of the couch."

There may be a lot of things that I, as an elected person, should be doing as well, maybe many more than even I can think of. But I just say, you know, remember and then believe that the power rests where it ought to rest, that is with you as an elector. Maybe there are some changes we have to make to our political institutions to make sure

that that functions. But if we stop believing that we have that control then we are going to lose it, and I think that is kind of scary.

Ms Brown: I think that is vital to a lot of issues. Your point was well made that we do have to solve this problem of the power. Each sort of different society's perception of the government and where the power is in the society, we have to solve that problem and make people understand that the power does rest with all different people, whether they be a common citizen or in the government. Then Meech Lake and GST, native rights, I think will come a lot easier. They will not come—

Mr Beer: I am not saying that.

Ms Brown: Well no, but in my opinion they will not be quite as hard to deal with.

Ms Boland: That was one of our main points actually before we came out, that before we deal with, you know, the issues of Quebec separating, GST and all those major political issues that have been about lately, we really have to overcome the obstacle of government—I am getting all—

Ms Brown: People feeling powerless.

Mr Bisson: I think that you are right in the sense is that this forum is quite good and allows you to interchange. I grew up in the olden days, in the 1960s, and we were very anti-establishment and believed the things that you are purporting, saying that, "You can't change the establishment eventually." Then we said, "We need to change it," and we went out and did all kinds of weird things.

Ms Boland: Has it really changed?

Mr Bisson: Yes, we had the old saying, "Tune in, turn on and drop out" type of thing, but that is something else.

Ms Boland: Maybe there was some validity to that.

Mr Bisson: But what I want to do is challenge you to something, because I think what people lack is the understanding of what the process is. People sometimes get the impression that we, as politicians, can wave a magic wand and come up with a very simple solution to a problem, not realizing sometimes that, if we are left talking to the federal government, if I was in the federal government, I would be only one of 26 million people and would look at things from where I come.

I challenge you to do this, to take whatever issue, and if you want to do it around what we are trying to do—trying to solve, let's say, the problems or go forward in regard to the Constitution—each one of you within your school gets as many people as you can involved and everybody plays a different role. Somebody be Alberta, somebody be Quebec, somebody be municipalities, somebody be the federal government, some represent various groups, the Confederation of Regions, l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario and all of that, and see how easy it is to come to a solution. You will find that part of the thing is that some people do not understand the process. We tend to look for solution from where we come from, and I look for solutions according to what I understand. If somebody looks at it differently from me, my perception as an individual maybe is, "Well, it's all wrong and you're doing it all wrong, so therefore, the system does not work." I think what you

were saying before—I did not get your name, the gentleman on the left, of the persuasion I liked—

1840

Mr Marans: Josh.

Mr Bisson: That was a joke. You are supposed to laugh, Charles.

The perception is right that a government sometimes has to make decisions for the common good that may not be acceptable to particular people within society, and maybe we have to get people to understand.

Mr Marans: An additional obstacle is that I do not believe education is there within the schools to help people understand what goes on in the government. By the time I was in grade 4, I had learned an awful lot more about Australia than I had about the Canadian government. I do not think I ever got the proper education on our government to fully understand our culture. Just as an aside, I recently did a survey of grade 7 students and they knew an awful lot more about the United States than they did about Canada, which says something about this. We really need to start spending money.

Ms Boland: Can I briefly elaborate a bit on what Josh said? I am taking a history course right now and we have just briefly gone over the process of the Canadian government, and it is so dry. It is so difficult to grasp—between the electoral government, democracy, direct democracy, I was totally lost, totally confused. It is really hard. You really have to get into the governmental system in order to understand it. It is very hard to just read from a book and understand how it is.

Mr Winninger: Come and visit us at Queen's Park.

Ms Boland: Maybe that would be better, really and truly.

Interjection.

Ms Boland: It is not you. It is just that the people are right to—

The Chair: Now that we have driven the technical people completely crazy—I think it has been quite useful to throw the rule book out the window for a few minutes and just go in this way. I want to give you an opportunity, if there are any final comments you want to make. We will have to move on.

Ms Molson: I want to make one final comment about the future of Canada and about the Quebec separatist thing and everything. I think people feel there is this lack of a Canadian identity. I think among young people there is a lot of pride in being a Canadian; it is considered a very important thing. Also, Canada in my view is well regarded by other countries. I would not want to be from any other country than Canada. When you see political jokes about other countries, the States, the USSR, in general Canada comes out looking pretty good, so I definitely am proud of being Canadian. I do not want it to separate. Even if it would be better for economic reasons or whatever, I think you should struggle to stay together, and I think that is a view shared by many, many people and not heard enough.

Ms Boland: Especially young people.

Ms Brown: Talking about economics, when we are talking about separation and the Canadian lifestyle, it always comes down to money. I do not understand why that is. Maybe I am naïve, I do not know, maybe I still have more to learn, but I do not understand why everything has to come down to money. Why can we not just be happy to be Canadians and be happy that we are diverse and that we have a lot of people within this country who are different and need recognition—but I do not think they need distinct recognition. I think we should have a greater understanding and Ontario can play a very good part in that.

Mr Williams: Could I add a word? One of the things that concerned me when I saw the process a few years ago when the premiers got together was, I was alarmed that they were coming to that conference with the idea of, "I'm going to look out for my province." They had shopping lists. I do not want the unity of Canada being brought by people who have shopping lists, who have vested interests. I want optimists. I want people who are looking for ways to share with each other part of the country. I would ask, in the process of deciding the fate of Canada let's have optimists rather than pessimists.

The Chair: Thank you. We understand there needs to be a lot more discussion about these issues and many other issues, and we as a committee are going to be looking for how we can structure more discussion in the next stage of our work more along the lines of the kind of discussion we have had here with you this evening which allows people to talk with us, and people have talked to each other as well. But we encourage you to do that also, within your own environment and your own school and your own classrooms, because that is also where it is going to happen and that is also where the kind of thinking needs to happen, in the schools, in the workplaces and anywhere else in the communities. But thank you for coming and talking to us this evening.

Ms Boland: Thank you very much for listening, too. I hope you did not misinterpret us. I am really happy that I got a chance to speak to you.

Ms Molson: Yes, so am I. It has changed my perspective.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Take care. We will try to get through the other two speakers who are on the printed list and then take a short break and come back after that.

RAYMOND BOUCHARD

The Chair: Could I invite Raymond Bouchard from l'école secondaire Marie-Rivier.

M. Bouchard : Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, bonsoir. Premièrement, j'aimerais dire que je fais partie de trois différents groupes, donc je préfère que mes opinions soient prises comme des opinions personnelles de sorte à ne frustrer personne.

Depuis déjà un certain temps, je ressens une inquiétude envers mon pays et ce que lui réserve l'avenir. Tellement de questions flottent dans mon esprit auxquelles je ne peux répondre, tellement de commentaires sont faits de part et d'autre qui me forcent à repenser ma position. Souvent je

ne retrouve affecté, voire même blessé par les remarques faites par certaines personnes. Celles-ci, il me semble, ressemblent à tout autre le droit d'être différent, voire même d'avoir des opinions autres que les leurs. D'ailleurs, j'ai été convaincu que dans la majorité des cas ces gens oublient ou ne réalisent pas que d'autres sont affectés par ce qu'ils disent. C'est pourquoi je remercie le gouvernement de l'Ontario de m'offrir cette opportunité d'exprimer mon opinion et probablement celles de milliers d'autres Canadiens et Canadiennes.

Loin de moi l'idée de montrer du doigt qui que ce soit. Enfin, je suis convaincu que le Canada est en pleine crise d'identité. Dans cette crise, trois groupes, soit la population du Québec, la population autochtone et la majorité anglophone du Canada, semblent revendiquer ce que chacun a le droit d'être un droit indéniable.

Pour composer avec les revendications de chacun, il faut d'abord reconnaître l'évidence de la situation. Indiscutablement, nous jouissons d'un des, pour ne pas dire «du», plus beaux pays du monde. Présentement, nous sommes dans une phase où nous refusons de voir à quel point nous sommes chanceux d'être Canadiens. Par le moment, nous essayons même de changer ou d'ignorer ce que nous sommes ainsi que nos origines. Je ne veux pas citer l'histoire de notre pays car nous tous la connaissons plus ou moins. Par contre, je veux rappeler à tous que nul d'entre nous n'a choisi sa race, sa couleur, sa langue, sa culture ou même l'endroit où il est né. En réalité, nous sommes tous les accidents de la nature, peu importe ce que nous en pensons.

Ceci dit, il est nécessaire de regarder ce que d'autres ont et ce que nous avons. Le Canada s'est procuré à travers les années de mécanismes sociaux que le monde entier nous envie tels l'assurance-maladie, l'assurance-chômage, la pension de vieillesse, le Régime de pensions pour n'en citer que quelques-uns. Combien d'entre nous jouiraient ou même pourraient s'offrir de tels programmes sans le système fédéral dans lequel nous vivons ? La grandeur, la diversité, la richesse du Canada garantit à tous ses citoyens et citoyennes une vie relativement facile. Les différentes origines et cultures des Canadiens et des Canadiennes ajoutent au charme et à l'aptitude de sa population de comprendre les problèmes des autres. Pourtant, il semble que nous sommes incapables de nous accepter tels que nous sommes.

1850

Pour débiter, je me dois de vous dire que je suis Canadien français, né à Alma, Lac-Saint-Jean dans la province de Québec. Je suis bilingue de façon intégrale depuis déjà plusieurs années. Pendant mes temps libres je suis très impliqué dans la communauté. Entre autres, je suis président d'une association de parents dans une école secondaire francophone et je suis membre de l'exécutif d'un centre culturel. Professionnellement, je suis militaire depuis 17 ans. De ce fait, j'ai eu la chance de vivre et de travailler à l'extérieur du pays plusieurs années.

Le Canada, à mes yeux, est probablement un des pays les plus favorisés dans le monde. Il regorge de toutes les ressources naturelles imaginables. Sa superficie est telle que nous pourrions multiplier notre population plusieurs

fois sans pour autant manquer d'espace. Notre système gouvernemental est un mélange du meilleur de plusieurs autres systèmes démocratiques. Ainsi nous, jouissons des possibilités législatives qui n'ont comme limites que celles que nous nous imposons. L'éventail de nos services sociaux n'a d'égal nul part ailleurs. Bien que chaque province et région du Canada soit différente l'une de l'autre par son économie, ses habitudes de vie, ses richesses naturelles et bien d'autres points, toutes ont besoin de sécurité et de prospérité. Toutes, à un moment ou à un autre, profitent des richesses et du succès des autres. À l'échelle individuelle, ceci se traduit par un des niveaux de vie les plus élevés au monde. Comment peut-on imaginer que la rupture du Canada ne soit pas ressentie à la grandeur du pays et sur tout ce qui touche à notre existence ?

La crainte de perdre leur identité et leur culture est commune à la majorité des Québécois. C'est-à-dire que plus de six millions de Canadiens et de Canadiennes sont inquiets de ce que leur réserve l'avenir. Des experts confirment cette crainte avec des recherches démographiques poussées.

Les demandes de nos autochtones ne sont-elles pas semblables si nous ajoutons à ces craintes un droit à l'autogérance ? Comment peut-on accepter que ce groupe particulier soit obligé de demander la permission au gouvernement fédéral pour gouverner leur communauté ? La création de nouvelles provinces ne devrait-elle pas être une chose décidée par la population en général et non par un petit groupe de politiciens ? L'idée d'un sénat tel qu'il existe présentement me semble révolue et surtout antidémocratique. Il faut donc ou l'abolir ou le redéfinir.

Depuis la découverte du Canada, trois groupes principaux se sont formés et côtoyés. Comment peut-on imaginer que certains Canadiens et Canadiennes refusent encore d'accepter ce fait ? À mon sens, les Québécois ne désirent pas changer le Canada mais désirent plutôt réaffirmer leur droit d'être ce qu'ils sont sans avoir à s'excuser à qui que ce soit dans le reste du pays. N'est-ce pas là la base même d'un système démocratique ?

Les autochtones n'ont-ils pas un droit indéniable de gérer leurs propres affaires comme le reste des Canadiens et Canadiennes le font dans leurs communautés ? Même les fondateurs de notre pays avaient cru bon reconnaître nos différences de sorte à préserver la paix et garantir un avenir à tous.

Pour ces raisons, mes recommandations seraient que tout doit être fait de sorte à préserver au Canada son aspect présent tout en respectant le droit de chacun des trois groupes distincts qui le forment.

La division des pouvoirs législatifs de chacun des paliers gouvernementaux devrait être revue de sorte à mieux refléter la situation démographique actuelle de notre pays ainsi que les différences régionales, et à rendre notre système plus efficace et capable de s'ajuster à tout changement.

Notre constitution doit reconnaître les trois groupes distincts qui ont vu la naissance de notre pays tout en respectant les droits de chaque Canadien et Canadienne.

Le Canada et la constitution devraient reconnaître au Québec le droit indéniable de protéger la culture et la langue particulières de la majorité de sa population de sorte à

freiner son assimilation par le groupe linguistique majoritaire continental.

Le Canada et la constitution devraient reconnaître aux autochtones le même droit à l'autodétermination reconnu aux autres Canadiens et Canadiennes, ceci incluant le respect des traités signés avec eux.

Le Canada et la constitution se doivent de reconnaître des limitations financières en regard à tous les groupes ethniques qui forment sa population globale, de sorte à éviter des demandes excessives dues aux différences de chaque groupe.

Le gouvernement fédéral devrait avoir le pouvoir d'établir des normes dans tous les domaines qui touchent la totalité de la population, peu importe leur lieu de résidence, de sorte à promouvoir l'égalité de tous.

Les provinces et territoires devraient avoir le pouvoir de légiférer dans tous les domaines qui touchent leur population, tout en respectant les normes établies par le gouvernement fédéral.

Pour conclure, les choses qui nous unissent et font notre force sont beaucoup plus importantes que celles qui nous séparent. Depuis plus de 124 ans, nous avons réussi à réconcilier nos différences et à prospérer ensemble. Je reste convaincu que l'avenir de chaque province et territoire dépend de celui de notre pays. C'est pourquoi je pense qu'il est critique de reconnaître au Québec ainsi qu'aux autochtones le droit de légiférer dans tous les domaines qui touchent leur culture et leur survie.

Permettre à ces deux groupes particuliers d'assurer leur avenir comme peuples distincts, à mon avis, n'enlève rien aux autres Canadiens. Au contraire, je crois que le Canada tout entier a tout à gagner à voir les Québécois ainsi que les autochtones heureux et prospères. Ce n'est que lorsque nous aurons résolu nos problèmes d'identité que nous pourrons nous remettre à avancer comme peuple. Il suffit de regarder le chemin parcouru depuis la création du Canada pour imaginer ce que nous pouvons espérer de l'avenir. Des milliers d'individus de partout dans le monde attendent pendant des années dans des conditions très difficiles pour avoir le droit au privilège de vivre dans notre pays et de se faire réel un rêve qui pour nous n'a rien de spécial. Suffit-il de demander à ces individus pourquoi le Canada et non un autre pays.

N'est-il pas temps que nous cessions de chercher nos défauts et que nous reconnaissons la chance que nous avons d'être nés et de vivre dans un aussi beau pays ? Si tous les Canadiens et Canadiennes s'y mettent, je suis absolument convaincu qu'il nous est impossible de ne pas trouver une solution.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Bouchard. On va passer à la prochaine présentation.

MIDGE ROUSE

The Chair: Could I call next Midge Rouse.

Ms Rouse: Good evening. I am Midge Rouse, the coordinator of native patient services at Hotel Dieu Hospital here in Kingston. I have been working with Mushkegowuk Cree from the west coast of James Bay for the past six years. My role has been to facilitate the delivery of tertiary medical care in Kingston. I would like to address the con-

cerns I have, first as a human being and second as a citizen of Canada, with the policies and practices of our federal and provincial governments and how they have affected the health, indeed the very survival, of the first nation people of Canada.

I apologize if you have heard this history lesson before. We are all aware that the two founding European nations of Canada ignored the historical and political structure that existed among the first nations during the federation of Canada. Imperialist policy of the time placed no value on the languages or cultures of the first nations. All land was claimed as belonging to the crown; the first nation people were merely residents on the land and therefore subjects of the crown. Those first newcomers believed it was easier to buy, to trade or to divide the land among themselves and the people of the first nations than it was to fight over the land. This practical approach to the colonization of Canada has remained a central theme in the myth of the peaceful settlement of new Canadians among the people of the first nations.

First nations people believed that indeed it was wiser to share the land with these newcomers, that it was possible to live side by side in harmony and with respect for each other. The first nations people did not wish or expect to interfere with the governing of the newcomers and neither did they agree to be governed by them. With these differing historical perspectives, the founding of the entity called Canada resulted in the creation of not two solitude but of many.

The history of the first nations since the middle of the 19th century has been a history of a systematic destruction of their cultures and societies. Successive federal and provincial governments have pursued policies which insured political and economic disparity—in fact, political marginalization and poverty. First nations people were not permitted to vote in federal elections until 1960, until the mid-1960s in provincial Alberta elections and 1969 in the province of Quebec.

The band councils, which are made up of elected representatives of the communities, a system which has been imposed by the federal government of Canada, have little political authority today. Any band council resolution or decision can be overturned by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs if there is an economic element. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, how many municipal decisions do not have an economic element? The band council is unable to raise income through the taxing of its members or independent economic development. The political organizations of the first nations, their newspapers, their radio and television programs are therefore all dependent on federal funding.

1900

Unemployment and underemployment on reserves is rampant. In 1985, 50% of all people living on reserves in Canada received an income from either family allowance or unemployment insurance, and their income was less than \$10,000 a year.

Treaty land today remains federal land. In the past, this meant the federal government could and would grant timber and mining rights, approve hydro development projects

construct highways and railways on reserve land without requiring the approval of the band or requiring compensation or profit-sharing agreements to the people of the first nations who occupied them. At present, reserve lands represent one twenty-fifth of Canada's land mass for 4% of our population. Reserve housing is substandard. In 1986, one third of the houses had no central heating and no bathrooms, one fifth had no running water, and overcrowding was rated 16 times above the national average.

The federal government's policy of assimilation and integration was vigorously pursued. The operation of the residential school system from 1889-1970 was based on a policy of aggressive civilization. For seven generations, first nations children were prohibited from speaking their languages and practising their religions. They were spiritually, physically and sexually abused.

A federal government official predicted in the 1930s that native people, with the exception of the Inuit, would be extinct within a generation, the victims of infectious diseases for which they had no immunity, poor or non-existent medical care, malnutrition and inadequate housing. However, improvements in medical services and technology reversed this trend. First nations people have the highest birth rate in Canada today and will soon be a majority in some provinces, particularly Manitoba. They have the shortest life expectancy, however—an average of seven to 10 years less than the national average—and they have an infant mortality rate twice the national average, equivalent to some developing countries.

Every day, working in the health care field, I see the effects of the changes in their lifestyle: a change in their diet, decrease in physical activity as a result of the introduction of skidoos and mechanical devices, and the increase in smoking and alcohol consumption. I see people with diabetes, renal disease, heart disease and cancer. It seems ironic to me that these diseases of the rich are prevalent among the poorest of our poor in Canada.

As a result of these political and economic conditions, the people of the first nations have experienced an unprecedented assault on their family and social structures. Family disintegration and its corresponding problems of alcoholism and other substance abuse, child neglect and abuse, violence, mental health problems, suicides and conflicts with the law exist in most first nations communities today in alarming numbers.

With this as their reality, and in order to save themselves, first nations people looked for a new way to deal with federal and provincial governments. Through a policy of cultural nationalism, they affirmed their special status in Canada. They do not want to be equal, if equal means they are just another cultural group in a multicultural Canada. They choose to retain their own cultural uniqueness. In the 1960s and 1970s the people of the first nations established and developed national political organizations. Many bands began to insist on administering their own schools and their own child welfare programs. In the 1980s and now in the 1990s they have vigorously asserted that their land claims be settled and their treaties maintained in an equitable manner.

We all heard in the spring of 1990 the voice of Elijah Harper, MLA from Manitoba, insisting upon the recognition of a new role for the people of the first nations in a revised Canadian Constitution and their active participation in determining that role. Some of us who live in Kingston had the opportunity of hearing George Erasmus, national chief in the Assembly of First Nations. Mr Erasmus spoke of his view of sovereignty and self-government. He said: "We live in the state of Canada. We've arrived at accommodation. We are Dene. We have Canadian citizenship. We're here, we're part of this country."

It sounds remarkably like the philosophy of those first nations people who met those European newcomers. It is wiser to live side by side in harmony, with mutual respect.

Before he was elected Premier, Bob Rae visited the Mushkegowuk Cree in their communities along the west coast of James Bay. He wrote upon his return, "Each community has its own unique character, but all share a common reality: profound and systemic poverty, a sense of powerlessness." He concluded: "Nothing in the division of powers, federal or provincial, or the natives' insistence on retaining their direct link with the federal crown, takes away from the fact that Ontario can do with its money what it pleases. This includes action for its first citizens."

We cannot repair the damage that has been done to our first citizens, but we can act. We cannot change our history but we can include their history, their languages and cultures in our future. We can do—to use a medical term—no more harm. We can make reparations and assist first nations people to heal themselves. We must not exclude first nations political organizations and traditional leaders from the next constitutional negotiations and the revised Constitution.

We must make a commitment to the first nations self-government and economic self-management and we must act on that commitment. Through land claim settlements and treaty maintenance, a land and capital base can be created. We can assist in the creation of healthy communities through the promotion of health in housing, water and sewage management, parks and recreation and education as well as community-developed public health programs.

It will probably take seven more generations before the people of the first generations have healed themselves, yet there is much hope among the people. They no longer endure in silence and their voices are being heard. If we listen to those voices, we will learn who we were, who we are and who we can be as citizens of Canada. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Rouse.

We will break at this point. For those people who may have joined us recently, we did start the afternoon session later because we were delayed in arriving from Cornwall, so we are running behind. We will need to take a short break. I am going to suggest to the committee members that we try very hard to get back and begin by 7:30. I know that only gives us a short break, but we will do our best. We have a number of people who have indicated that they wish to speak to the committee in the evening session. We will recess until then.

The committee recessed at 1909.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1949.

The Chair: I can call the meeting to order. Good evening, first of all. I am Tony Silipo, the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. On behalf of the committee, I would like to welcome those of you who have come here this evening. I know a number of you were here this afternoon, but a number of people have joined us for our evening sitting here in Kingston.

This is our final week of hearings across the province. We have been in a number of communities in various parts of the province, and we are during this week travelling through various communities in the eastern part of the province.

We heard from a number of people earlier today; earlier today we were also in Cornwall. We have again this evening a number of people on the list to speak to us and, as we have had to do on these kinds of occasions, particularly in the evening sittings where we tried to make the proceedings less formal and open it up to more people to speak, the only way in which we can accommodate the number of people who have registered at the table to speak is by being strict with the time in terms of limiting ourselves to five minutes per presenter. I apologize if that restrains the kinds of things people want to say to us, but it is an opportunity to give people a chance to talk to us and to try to get to as many people as we possibly can.

We are starting late because, as you may or not know, we were late coming into town earlier today. We will sit later than we had planned to try to accommodate as many people as we can, but we also ask for your co-operation and patience in that.

Before calling the first speaker, just a couple of other housekeeping things. We have a number of people already on the list, but in the event that there are others we may not have put on the list—there are—there are people at the back of the room at a table there, if you would like to add your name.

The other thing is that there are still some translation devices available at the back of the room if people want to sign those out, because our proceedings go on in English and French and the presentations may be in either language, so for people's assistance that is also available.

Finally, I would just like to introduce the members of the committee. This is an all-party committee, as you may know, made up of representatives from the three political parties represented at Queen's Park. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative caucus we have Charles Harnick and Chris Stockwell. From the NDP caucus, in addition to myself there are Gary Malkowski, Marilyn Churley, Gilles Bisson, the Vice-Chair of our committee—we hope will be rejoining us shortly—Fred Wilson, David Winninger and Gary Wilson.

R. W. ORMEROD

The Chair: We will begin with R. W. Ormerod.

Mr Ormerod: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the subject, I believe, is Ontario in Confederation and what this committee would like to hear that we do about it. I think, first of all, Ontario should re-enter the democratic scene in that everybody in the province is equal but, first and foremost, the people of Ontario should be given the opportunity to earn a living and be respectable citizens of the whole country.

The background of the situation in which we find ourselves today, of course, is that the NDP government is here on a negative basis. It was because of the dislike for the Tories and the Liberals that you are sitting here this evening. That is painfully obvious, so your tenure could be quite short. The point, though, I am trying to make is while you are here you have been saddled with a debt of some \$70 billion; this includes, of course, the \$10 billion it is suggested you will add to the \$60 billion-plus you already have. So the climate is very difficult for any politician to keep this playing field level.

I am concerned that the first thing the government should do is to protect the culture and the heritage of the English-speaking people of Canada who made this country what it is today, first. The second thing is that you should develop a system of fiscal responsibility. Throwing money at anything does not solve the problem. Pragmatism is what is needed in order for this province to once again become the energetic and productive part of Canada it was in the 1950s.

Referring back to the heritage of this country, I think it is high time the provincial government of Ontario allowed British history and British culture to be taught in this province. It is wrong in a democratic country to deny citizens the ability to study their culture and their language with, on the other hand, gross wet-nursing to another province. It makes absolutely no sense. In view of the astronomical debt the NDP has picked up and the increase they will apply this year, does it seem reasonable that we should give Quebec \$4.6 billion? Who is the poor province? I think we are. We are shovelling this money into another province.

Here locally the Québécois who have been parachuted into Kingston are now demanding \$80 million to provide themselves with a school and a cultural centre, yet, on the other hand, the schools are not allowed to teach English to Canadians their culture or their history. In a democratic country everybody surely should have the same opportunities and the same chance.

I must repeat that the astronomical debt we have in the province, plus that we are facing in the federal government—announced recently, about 4 o'clock today, it is \$400 billion, and the interest on that is going to reach \$40 billion very shortly—nobody but nobody has any money. We in the city here are in debt because our infrastructure is crumbling and we have not the money to repair it, but here

we have these trucks in the street, we have this caravan—
 all going all around the province at a fantastic cost.

I hope you will bear in mind, first, Ontario men and women, and then the rest of Canada. Let's not start giving away our birthright because we have not the gumption to stand up and protect the people who made Canada what it is today.

Mr Harnick: I had a couple of brief questions for you. I understand you are a member of the Alliance for the reservation of English in Canada?

Mr Ormerod: Yes.

Mr Harnick: You can maybe enlighten us. How come we have heard that speech in many places but no one ever admits they belong to APEC? Why do they never say that?

Mr Ormerod: I do not know.

Mr Harnick: Are you embarrassed about that organization? Why would you not be forthright and tell us you are a member of APEC?

Mr Ormerod: In 1986, I joined the APEC organization in this very hall. It calls for the protection of the English language, the protection of the English culture and the protection of Canada as it was. For reasons which were mostly financial, we decided to open up our own organization known as the National Association for English Rights here in Kingston so we could get closer to the grass-roots, to the people who put you gentlemen into the provincial Parliament. We are very proud of the fact that we are now the National Association for English Rights Inc, a federal incorporation; furthermore, we have on our record of membership 500 members paid up and a supporting membership of over 5,000 on our computer.

000

Mr Harnick: Well, that leads me to my next question.

The Chair: Sorry—

Mr Harnick: Just for one moment, please, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: All right. Very briefly, please.

Mr Harnick: We had some people come to see us today, students from St Joseph's School in Prescott and from the Kingston Collegiate and Vocational Institute. I think they were pretty representative of the young people who live in this area, and quite frankly—I want you to help us because we are going to have to grapple with these issues—your organization was probably the furthest thing from the way they wish to see this province and this country develop. That was the gist of their evidence, and they are the people we will be leaving a legacy for. They did not like your position in terms of the English language; they did not feel it was threatened. And they were concerned about Quebec leaving Canada, they did not want Quebec to separate from Canada. I am puzzled, because the Canada you envision is totally different from the Canada the young people who have come before us envision, and that causes me some very grave concerns.

Mr Ormerod: May I answer Mr Harnick?

The Chair: Go ahead; yes.

Mr Ormerod: First, the children who come to speak to you have been brainwashed by our school system very thoroughly, but more important I think is that the preponderance of people who have addressed your committee and the preponderance of people who have had the most time have been Québécois, or they have been Québécois who have been parachuted into this area for a good reason.

The Chair: Sir, sir—

Mr Ormerod: Excuse me, I have the right to answer this gentleman—

Mr Harnick: I would like an answer, though. You have not—

Mr Ormerod: I have a right to answer him, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: All right, go ahead.

Mr Harnick: But you are not.

Mr Ormerod: It is a fact that every meeting you have held so far has been heavily biased in favour of the Québécois or, if you like, the association of French in Ontario. Furthermore, that body received last year \$4.7 million to support its activism in this province, and we, the National Association of English Rights, do not get one red cent. Furthermore, the francophone association of Ontario gets tax credits for anyone who gives it money. We have applied, APEC has applied, and we have applied five times to get the same credits. No way. That is why I say it is time that Ontario got back to democracy where everybody is treated equally and where the people who built this country are not being subjected to the tyranny of biased politics. In fact, favouritism to one province should never be.

The Chair: All right. Thank you, sir, for your views.

Mr Ormerod: Any more questions?

The Chair: I am chairing the meeting, sir.

Mr Ormerod: This gentleman here wishes to ask a question.

The Chair: He will ask the question if I allow him to ask the question. This is how we are going to run the meeting. You have answered the questions you have been asked and that is fine. We are going to carry on with the next speaker.

I just wanted to clarify something you said earlier. I just wanted you and everyone else to be aware that of all of the groups that have presented before us, the francophone association and individuals, to our knowledge all of them are Ontarians, and I think that they have the same rights you and I have as members of this society in Ontario. Thank you very much.

Mr Ormerod: Mr Chairman, I did not say they should have different rights.

The Chair: I was not asking you a question, sir. I want to move on.

Mr Ormerod: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for your time and thank you very much for the kind attention of the audience.

VINCE MALONEY

The Chair: Is Vince Maloney here? Go ahead, sir.

Mr Maloney: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. I wish to express my gratitude for this opportunity. I can tell you that I do not envy you your job because I have had the opportunity to watch—

[Failure of sound system]

The Chair: Go ahead, sir.

Mr Maloney: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I do not wonder at this mike being a little out of order after the last speech.

It is my opinion that what Canada most desperately needs is leadership with imagination to set our goals for the year 2000 and beyond. There has been a complete vacuum for the past several decades from Ottawa, an ad hocery and Band-Aid approach.

If we simply go back to Expo 67, our 100th birthday, we did a pretty good job. Canada's Expo was the envy of the world and gave all Canadians a feeling of immense pride.

We had emerged from the Second World War with enormous worldwide prestige, had inaugurated the first air mail service in the world, had a very large navy and merchant marine, well-trained workforce, industrial plants, raw material and the energy required to manufacture all forms of machinery and equipment to supply world needs.

When we consider our maritime coastline, we rank either first or second of all the nations of the world. For our leaders to fritter away our ability to ship the products of our forests, mines and fields, to transport our goods to the markets of the world was shortsighted and negligent.

Was there a single Canadian not bursting with pride in 1972 in the final game in Moscow when Paul Henderson scored when he got a pass from Yvan Cournoyer, if my memory serves me right? No question of English and French there. That combined Canadians from all parts of Canada: Henri Richard, Guy Lafleur, Jacques Plante and many others. No one resented the fact that some were from Quebec. We all shared and celebrated the victory.

A more recent event was the victory of the games in western Canada when the young Canadians, a team from all over Canada, were able to win the gold medal.

It seems to me that a very serious virus invaded Canada from south of the border. This disease became more visible during the term of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. It manifested itself in meanness and greed. It perhaps began in California under Proposition 13 and spread slowly eastward and northerly.

In Canada it was eagerly embraced by the C. D. Howe Institute, Fraser Institute, National Citizens' Coalition and Business Council on National Issues. These so-called think tanks think about enhancing their personal wealth more than Canadians' wellbeing. Their false prophets hoodwinked Canada into buying the Mulroney leap of faith and entering into the free trade agreement with the promise of even greater prosperity and jobs, jobs, jobs. Greater protection for displaced workers, child care, universal in nature, enhanced protection for seniors. There was nothing these spin doctors would not promise.

The resulting misery of the free trade agreement and the made-in-Canada depression we now suffer plays no favourites: native people, francophone, anglophone, and every other ethnic group. Meanwhile bank presidents and Canadian heads of multinational corporations, who have not already left for greener pastures in Mexico, have told Canadians to suffer even more with the GST. The only reason Michael Wilson has recently lowered the interest rate is simply because he could no longer tolerate it being higher than the popularity of his government. Hopefully both will continue the downward trend.

2010

End of the Meech Lake accord: Mulroney rolling the dice; forcibly confining one Premier from leaving; blustering threatening and lying by him and his other bully, Lower Murray; Canadian public shut out completely; no native people, no women, no trade unionists, no farmers. Is it any wonder it failed? We have had enough of these snake-oil peddlars. One cannot make a silk purse from a sow's ear. This exercise is as welcome as a breath of fresh air. At least you are making it possible to hear the frustrations and feeling of isolation by the general public.

It is very difficult to not have a deep source of pessimism about the future of Canada, Ontario and Quebec when we contemplate the calibre of our present Tory government. Would that a leader with the vision of Sir John A. Macdonald were in charge of the Tory government. Our ship of state is rudderless and without captain or crew. Meanwhile the engine, Ontario, is being dismantled piece by piece. When John Crosbie informed Nova Scotians they should compare their quality of life with Haiti and be satisfied, given more time Haitians will have no reason to be envious.

The Chair: Sir, perhaps you could sum up, please.

Mr Maloney: It is my conviction that Canada needs leadership to again put Canada on the rails. Hopefully this committee is the first step. When people are worried about losing their jobs, homes and families by deliberate acts of the federal government, they strike out blindly. It is easy to blame other visible minorities, innocent though they may be.

With the potential wealth of Canada, coupled with a strategic plan to utilize our resources, our energy, our productive capacity, we could again be the envy of the world. We cannot unless we set realistic, attainable goals, sell it to the people of Canada and set our course.

Now is not the time for political decisions related only to the next election. We are only borrowing Canada from the generations to come and they deserve much better stewardship than we have been providing.

PETER CAMPBELL

The Chair: Could I call next Peter Campbell. Next will be calling Dr E. H. Storey. Mr Campbell, go ahead.

Mr Campbell: I would like to address what I consider to be a number of myths which are creating a great deal of confusion at the present time. These are not myths which have to do with the Constitution itself, but rather myths which have to do with history, language and culture.

Myth 1 is that Canada is in the process of falling apart. This is a myth for the simple reason that something which has never been together cannot fall apart. There has never been any kind of any real understanding in this country between French and English, any shared history. As a Canadian historian, I feel no qualms at all about stating the obvious fact that there is no such thing as Canadian history. We have one history according to the English, one history according to the French and one history according to the native people. There is no Canadian history. We have no shared historical and cultural symbols.

Myth 2: According to many Ontarians, and especially the English rights movement, if we let Quebec go we will be rid of our language problems. This is a myth because if Franco-Ontarian ties with Quebec are weakened, the 500,000 francophones in Ontario will be forced to fight even harder for their rights. They will in effect be forced to become more, not less, militant. In other words, if Quebec separates we may not see the end of French-English conflict in Ontario, but in fact we will see its beginning.

Myth 3: Official bilingualism has been a success. This is a myth, but I say it not as a supporter of the English rights movement but as someone coming from the political left. The Liberal vision, the Trudeau vision, was fatally flawed because it argued that language was the key: If people can talk to each other, they will understand each other. The people who put bilingualism together had obviously never been married. This is of course a myth. As an anglophone it does me no good to talk to a francophone whose English is perfect but who knows nothing about who I am, where I come from and what I care about. I would much rather talk to a francophone whose English is poor but who knows something about my history and culture and what I care about.

The fact that there are some 15,000 francophones now in the federal civil service also means little if anything to most Québécois, especially if they live in places like Quebec City, Montreal and the Gaspé. The fact that francophones are getting jobs with the Ontario government is basically irrelevant to the vast majority of francophones in Quebec. In short, official bilingualism demonstrates the victory of form over content.

Myth 4: Francophones do not want to be Canadians. This is a myth because English Canadians have never given francophones a chance to be Canadians. A few weeks ago, Charles Goulet spoke French in Kingston and was booed. Mr Goulet was told in no uncertain terms that you cannot speak French in Kingston and be a Canadian. Yet Mr Goulet could move to St Petersburg, Florida; Fresno, California, or Little Rock, Arkansas, and speak French and he would be considered an American, yet in his own country he is not considered a Canadian by many people. Francophones are not Canadians for the simple reason that most English-speaking people in this province have never considered them Canadians.

I have three proposed solutions I would like to talk about:

1. The government of Ontario should go on record as supporting important symbolic initiatives which will indicate to the people of Quebec before the referendum is held,

probably in the fall of 1992, that we consider them full and equal partners in Canadian Confederation. One of the important gestures for the Québécois, and native people and immigrants as well, would be to replace the picture of the Queen on some of our currency with actual figures from Canadian history.

Some suggestions might be Samuel de Champlain, Jacques Cartier, Dollard des Ormeaux, John Cabot, who is English—Jean Cabot when he is French; he was actually Giovanni Caboto; he was actually Italian—Josiah Henson, the black leader and Crowfoot. I have here a picture my daughter did of a \$20 bill with a picture of Crowfoot on it replacing the Queen. I cannot imagine a better symbol of a Canadian who fought for his people, who fought for his land and fought about the future instead of the past. Other people would be Tommy Douglas; Nellie McClung, both for what she did and also because it indicates that there actually were women in Canadian history, or perhaps the most important, who I consider the most important figure in Canadian history, Louis Riel; in other words, some symbolic indication that Canada has been about more than the Queen of another country or the white men who controlled its political, social and economic life.

2. Official bilingualism should be scrapped because it does not work. The money, however, should be used to promote the French language and culture in other ways, including the maintenance and expansion of French immersion programs, which to the contrary are actually working amazingly well. The government of Ontario should arrange with the government of Quebec for an exchange of teachers so that Canadian history from a Québécois perspective can be taught in as many Ontario high schools as possible and English Canadian history taught in as many Quebec high schools as possible.

In addition, the NDP government of Ontario should immediately, next week not next year, announce the building of at least one francophone university in Ontario, hopefully with funding from the federal government. This university would hopefully attract francophone scholars from Quebec and around the world and its core purpose would be to issue degrees in French-English relations and would hopefully foster poor and working-class French and English students to go to this university.

2020

3. Finally, we have to bury the battle of the Plains of Abraham. It is clear and tragic that many English Ontarians continue to define who they are in terms of that battle. They feel that because we beat the French in 1759 that they should go away or at least roll over and play dead. The time has ended for ordering our political life around battles which happened centuries ago. We have a historic opportunity as Canadians to say to Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, Hindus and Muslims in India and Pakistan that we can order our lives in terms of the needs of today's world, not in terms of old wounds and old battles.

In that spirit, the government of Ontario should arrange to throw a big party at the Citadel in Quebec City, maybe on Canada Day this year or next year. We could have two people dressed up as Montcalm and Wolfe shake hands

and bury their swords. Afterwards, French and English together, we could all repair to the Château Frontenac and have a few beers.

Lighten up, Ontario. Most Québécois do not want massive new constitutional powers. They are not being parachuted in from Quebec. How many different ways can they tell us that they are frightened about their future, that they are worried their children will lose their culture and language and that they are trying to keep that from happening? Sounds like some English people I know in Kingston.

We have a choice. We can respond to their concerns with condemnation or we can accept that a key part of being Canadian is ensuring the continued survival of the French language and French culture in this continent. Rather than condemning that effort, we should embrace the opportunity to help the French-speaking members of the Canadian community realize their goals. We should not see it as some kind of onerous task. We should welcome the opportunity.

The people of Quebec want what they have always wanted, and what we all want, a little respect and a little recognition. Maybe if the respect and recognition finally come, the re-creation of the nation will not be so difficult after all.

[Interruption]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Campbell. Just for the members of the audience, I did not interrupt Mr Campbell because I have a copy of what he was saying and it was clear that he was getting near the end.

The Chair: We will move on to the next speaker, Dr Ted Storey.

Mr Fraser: Mr Chairman, I have a suggestion and that is that one of the groups would hold up its hand when we have 30 seconds left of the five minutes.

The Chair: I usually interrupt the speakers and let them know when they are very close to the time, and as I said I did not do that with the last speaker because it was clear to me that he was getting near to the end of the presentation.

Mr Fraser: Yes, but both the last two speakers—

The Chair: Yes, I realize that, sir, and I appreciate your reminding me of that. I will try to be stricter as we go along and you will see that happening if people continue to take longer than the five minutes.

E. H. STOREY

The Chair: Go ahead, Dr Storey.

Dr Storey: Mr Chairman and members of the commission, I find myself in a rather difficult position because I have been watching you on television and I saw that you had 10-minute presentations and that is what I prepared. I will try to shorten it a bit, but I hope you will bear with me.

The Chair: You will have to shorten it, sir.

Dr Storey: I would like to first commend you on the conduct of your meetings throughout this province. I have been following you on television and I feel that a great deal of benefit is accruing from the open exchange of di-

verse views, proposed solutions and passionate pleas for Canadian unity.

We have been shown that while there are some who would say, "Let Quebec go," there are more of us who want Quebec to continue as a valued partner in our federal system. If there are among us those who are intolerant of differences, there are more of us who respect differences and appreciate and understand the value of distinctiveness and of diversity to the character of Canada and of Canadians.

I believe very strongly that the future of our country rests in our willingness to respect and indeed to cherish the distinctiveness that creates the warp and the weft of the very fabric of this country, and on our ability to open our minds to the exciting opportunity that we now have to look creatively and innovatively towards our Canada of tomorrow.

The need for constitutional change in Canada derives from concerns expressed in all regions of the country that our present political structures and processes are not responsive to perceived persistent inequities in such matters as the distribution of the national wealth; economic opportunity, including employment; jurisdictional powers; cultural sovereignty and multiculturalism; language rights; immigration, the rights of women and of the aboriginal peoples; resource management; taxation and revenue-sharing, and our international relationships.

The oft-repeated claim that the failure of the Meech Lake accord was a rejection of Quebec as a significant member of our federal system should thus be put to rest. The Meech Lake accord was rejected primarily because of the perception that it placed the nation in a constitutional straightjacket, hobbling its future ability to address equitably nationwide and regional concerns through effective constitutional reform or restructuring. We now have the opportunity to build a better Canada than Meech Lake offered us. Let's take advantage of that opportunity.

I have travelled across this country several times. I have always been impressed by the distinctiveness of each of the different parts of this country and I have been impressed that wherever I went, despite the distinctiveness, despite the fact that in some parts of the country I was from Upper Canada or a maudit Anglais or a God-damned easterner, I was always treated fairly, warmly and with respect as a fellow Canadian and I have always come back to Ontario feeling immense pride in our country and in being a Canadian.

So the conviction that I have today is that the greatness of Canada rests in not the sameness but the distinctiveness of each of its provinces and territories and that the country is far, far greater than the sum of its parts because of that distinctiveness. That is the conviction that I have today and it is the reality that I want this country to carry into the future. The beauty, the strength and the potential of Canada lies in its diversity and the distinctiveness of its parts as they combine to form a united whole. Any part that would be lost to us would diminish the strength and the spirit of our nation, and of the part that would be lost to us as well in ways that are disproportionate to the strength and the potentials of each.

I would like to remind you that we may have lost faith in some political leaders, we may have lost faith in our

tional government, but we have not lost faith in this country. Some will say that faith is not enough, but let's remember that Canada has always been a miracle of faith and let's remember that faith has inspired us through our pioneering years, two world wars, a Great Depression and our new-found prosperity, as we have evolved from a colony to what I believe is the finest nation in the world, warts and all.

Let's remember that while the United States came about through a revolutionary war, Canada developed through peaceful evolution. That fact is reflected in our sharing, sharing society that makes us a special place that is envied so much by the rest of the world. So let's buckle down to the task.

In recent weeks there have been some very positive indicators that Canada can and will meet its present constitutional challenge and will do so in a creative, responsive and forward-looking way. The game is afoot, ladies and gentlemen.

The Chair: Mr Storey, you are going to have to sum up.

Dr Storey: May I finish with four principles?

The Chair: Very quickly.

Dr Storey: Okay. The four principles that I feel could underlie our Confederation are these:

First of all, the federal system, which places those things that are of importance to the nation as a whole and our national institutions under the sovereignty of the federal government.

The second level of government, the provinces and territories, should have sovereignty over those matters that are of local and provincial relevance, and that means having sovereignty over those matters that nurture the distinctiveness and the self-determination of each of the provinces and regions. I believe that should be one of the underlying principles as we look for a reconstituted federal system.

One of the things that we do not want is provinces that have special status. I believe that we should stick with the equality principle as a part of that federal principle, but I think we need to take a second look at that equality principle and recognize a third principle, and that is the principle that being equal does not mean being identical. It is time to recognize that the distinctiveness and the diversity mentioned earlier that we cherish dictate that being equal should not mean being identical. Equality and status must mean having equality and opportunity to be distinctive and equality in opportunity to be responsive to differing provincial needs, values, cultures and economic circumstances. So we must celebrate our diversity and our distinctiveness.

030

One final principle, the principle of something of value. If we are going to take something away from our Constitution, let's make sure that we put something of value in its place, something of value to all parts of the country and to the country as a whole.

I will finish by simply saying I believe that our country, our Canada, has a future. I believe that in the majesty of our landscape and the potentials of all our people and

above all in the gentleness and the strength of our gentleness and our caring for each other throughout this land, there is hope and there is faith in our promise that we must keep for ourselves, for our children and our grandchildren, and the larger world that needs Canada for what it is and what it can become. Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

JAMES ILETT

The Chair: Could I call next James Ilett. Following that I will be calling Neil Fraser. Mr Ilett, go ahead.

Mr Ilett: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and good evening members of the committee. The last four acts are rather hard to follow and I cannot promise you anything quite as exciting as they offered, but at least I think what I have to say is very relevant to the practical agenda.

I am sure the committee members are all familiar with the content of the Allaire report and you will have your own opinions about what arrangements of this sort would do to the Canadian Confederation. I do not think I need elaborate on that further. But at least the Allaire commission has placed some concrete proposals on the table.

The fact of the matter is that Quebec is not the only region of the country that is disenchanted with the present federal system. It seems to me, therefore, that it is a mistake to concentrate our whole attention on the subject of relations between Quebec and the rest of the country, because the problem is bigger than that.

I would like to suggest that what we really need to do is to think out the sort of Canada that all Canadians, or most Canadians, want for the 21st century and then having defined what we want, consider in practical terms how we get there. Although this is very obvious as soon as you say it, I think if we could take this in two stages and first of all define the Canada we want in terms of concrete aims and then in the second stage consider what arrangements we make to achieve those aims, we can get away from all this emotional stuff about federal and provincial powers and just think in practical terms about functions and services and how they are best organized and how they can be paid for.

In order to try and concretize this, I have set for myself some six aims. But before trying to do this, I thought it was worth while maybe to remind myself of some salient facts about our country.

First of all—and here again, I hope you and the people behind me will forgive me if I point out the obvious, but occasionally it does need to be pointed out—we have a huge country. We have almost 7% of the world's land mass and a substantial proportion of its fresh water, but we have less than half a per cent of the world's population and a large amount of this land mass we do not effectively occupy.

In a world in which the total world population will have increased by about 50,000 in the few hours that you are in Kingston—in other words, the whole population of the Northwest Territories—when the world population is increasing at this speed, it seems to me it is not realistic to think that we are going to retain sovereignty over so huge an area without doing anything with it. To many of us the north seems pretty inhospitable, but to a lot of people in

the world it will be a lot better than nothing. So that is fact one to bear in mind.

Fact two to bear in mind is that Quebec is, whether you like it or not, most certainly a distinct society, but it is not the only distinct society. I would think from what I have seen of Newfoundland, in different ways that is also a distinct society, and certainly the Inuit and the Indian communities of the north must be very much more distinct. So we should not get too hung up on this matter.

The next thing is that most of the people in Canada have a high material standard of living and I think we can say we use a good deal of this material wealth very sensibly to have a good quality of life. We have all sorts of things that we all know about—health services, parks and so on. But this material standard is not a birthright. We have to earn it year by year in a competitive world and in a world that is getting more and more competitive. Now, the competition gets less and less in terms of hewing wood and drawing water and more and more in terms of organization and technology. This is brain power.

The Chair: Mr Ilett, I am going to have to ask you to sum up very quickly. You are past the time.

Mr Ilett: These and other obvious things one can point out, but having thought about these points, my six aims for Canada would be these.

The Chair: You will have to do that very quickly, sir.

Mr Ilett: Yes, very quickly.

(1) That we have effective control of all the territory; (2) that we are a democratic society; (3) that we have equality of opportunity, personally and regionally; (4) that we have efficient delivery of services that can only be provided publicly or better be provided publicly; (5) that we have an efficient economy which can compete and collaborate globally, and (6) that we have a social security net for the disadvantaged and the handicapped who cannot take advantage of the equality of opportunity.

If you think of how you achieve those six objectives, obviously it has implications at all levels of government, and if I could just repeat, please think of it in terms of how we achieve these practically in terms of who carries out the functions and who provides the services, not in terms of who has powers.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr Ilett: Thank you.

NEIL FRASER

The Chair: Neil Fraser, and I will be calling next Arthur Keppel-Jones.

Mr Fraser: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, first of all, in brief, what makes Canada great is its care and compassion. I am just going to try and touch on a few things that have not been touched on.

What we need within Canada is free trade within Canada, and as a provincial government, I would hope you would work at that. Ontario is more than likely guilty as well as Quebec, but I know people from Quebec working for Ontario Hydro, for example, who speak very little English. I have no objection to their working in Ontario Hydro, except that the opposite does not hold true. You

cannot get a job in Quebec speaking English and very little French.

This free trade bit goes down to agricultural products all sorts of things. We should have worked on free trade in Canada before we worked on it with the United States. But in little things like employment, people are being turned down for the OPP in Ontario because they do not speak French, yet we are having people recruited from New Brunswick and Quebec who may not speak very much English for the OPP. I would challenge you, members of the committee, go back and ask the OPP. I cannot get the truth out of anyone; I hope you can.

2040

The educational system: By and large we have had a good educational system, but we now are faced in Ontario with really three school systems: the public, which is not basically an atheistic system with a few concerned Christians, Jews, Muslims; a separate school system, which is really one state-supported religion, and now a French system.

I would prefer one system. I know at this time in history it is not possible, but something has to be worked out more equitably, whether you look at a credit system, but is not fair for Protestants and Jewish people, anyone who wants a Christian education outside of Roman Catholicism, to not be able to get some public support.

As far as our relationship with Quebec is concerned, I want Quebec to stay as an equal partner, but I do not want it to stay as an unequal partner. The CBC is partly responsible for not telling the Canadian people exactly what has gone on in this country, and I would suspect that TVOntario gives a disproportionate amount of support to TVOntario and the francophone network if you took the proportion of the society and the dollars equated.

I am not against the French language. I am not able to speak French. I took an oral French course once, but that would not do you much good unless you actually went and lived in Quebec or among the francophone community. But I am against government pushing one language at the expense of another. In Ontario today you call up and you get "Bonjour." Okay, fellows, if that is the way you want it, I suggest that you write and contact Mr Bourassa and have him say "Good morning" in English in Quebec.

There is no historical evidence for two founding nations, so anyone who studies history has to reject that. At the time of Confederation all the parts of the country were crown colonies. Now, we French and English can work together, but official bilingualism is nothing to do with language, it is all to do with power, and that is why you have an English rights movement: because we are concerned about equality.

If you look in Quebec, just as an example there, about 17% of the population is non-French. I do not have recent statistics, but in 1981-82 you had about 1% of the federal public service in Quebec who were non-French. So you can see where the federal government lies.

I have contact with people in Ontario, and already under the Liberal government you had a preference for francophones in supervisory positions. This is why many of us would not like to see Ontario officially bilingual. It is not that we are against communicating; it is that we are

against arbitrarily having members of one group get all supervisory and management positions based on their ability to speak a language rather than on their ability for the job.

The Chair: Sir, I am going to have to ask you to sum up, please.

Mr Fraser: Basically, I just want to say that the students we had are part of the school system. I will just say that my own children came up through the system, and they would agree to a large extent. But my youngest son got through university two years ago, and he said: "Dad, I used to think you were all wet, but I had a classmate who was turned down for a job in the summer because he couldn't speak French. French wasn't required and he was better qualified for the job, but a French person got the job." What I would like to see in Canada is that if a French person is the best qualified for the job, he gets the job; if an English person or an aboriginal or whoever—it is based on merit, not on what your ethnic background is, and I think if we try to work together we can make Canada great.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ARTHUR KEPPEL-JONES
HUGH G. THORBURN

The Chair: Could I call next Arthur Keppel-Jones, followed by Hugh Thorburn.

Dr Keppel-Jones: Professor Thorburn and I are making a joint submission. We have given in a memorandum for paper which will say much more than we can say now, but we would like to speak briefly to this memorandum.

We have begun from this point, that we think it is a serious mistake to suppose that whatever additional powers are given to Quebec should be given also to every other province individually. We think this mistakes the nature of the problem. Though every province and region has its distinctiveness, the wrangles of the last many years over the Constitution have shown that the relation of Quebec to our federation is a much more serious and immediate problem than the relation of any other province to it. In fact, basically, in spite of the distinctiveness of other provinces, Canada really consists not of 10 parts but of two, Quebec and the rest, and we approach the problem that is now critical in this country with that fact in mind.

We have concluded that there are three main requirements which any solution of our constitutional problem must meet. The first is that it must hold Canada together. That is to say, a secession of Quebec, a mere breakaway of Quebec, would have very harmful effects. The harm would be felt, first of all, in the economy. Investors are very sensitive of any political instability and the approach of a crisis such as this, a Quebec breakaway, would certainly drive a lot of money out of the country and that would be followed by a number of economic consequences.

But there are also other harmful effects that a breakaway of Quebec would have. I need only mention as an obvious one that the Atlantic provinces would be left up in the air, as it were, but that is just one of them. So we think Quebec must not break away but must be retained in some form of union with the rest of Canada. That is our first point.

The second point is that Quebec must have more powers and independence than it has now. It is obvious that is what the Québécois are demanding and they will not be satisfied with anything less.

The third point is that in the rest of Canada, in the nine remaining provinces, opinion goes the opposite way from that in Quebec. It does not favour decentralization. It favours greater unity and centralization. So a solution would have to meet those three requirements, keeping Quebec in Canada, giving it far more power, but also giving the rest of Canada greater unity.

That is a very difficult puzzle to solve, but my colleague, Professor Thorburn, is going to give you some ideas about the constitutional form that a solution might take. I will just be content to say this, that it seems to us it follows logically from these facts that Canada should become a confederation of two states: one of which is itself the federation, the present Canadian federation minus Quebec, more unified and centralized than it is now; the other is Quebec, united to the other federation in a looser union. That is the conclusion we come to from our analysis of what the problem is about.

We would ask people who criticize the proposed solution—of course, it will be very widely and generally criticized—to focus not on our constitutional proposals but on our analysis of what the problem is about, our statement that three conditions have to be met, retaining Quebec in Canada, giving Quebec much more independence and giving the rest of Canada greater unity, because that is what experience over many years now seems to show public opinion in the different parts of the country demand.

I would like to say, just before I hand over to my colleague, that we do not regard our proposals as a kind of stopgap to put off the day of the inevitable breakup. We do not regard it in that way at all. We hope an arrangement can be found which will actually be satisfactory to both English Canada and Quebec, which will give advantages that both of them value, and that therefore the wrangling we have been going through will not have to be repeated. Thank you. I will hand over to Hugh.

2050

Dr Thorburn: Would you like to ask my colleague questions first, or shall I just pick up?

The Chair: We will see if there is time at the end of your presentation, if there are questions.

Dr Thorburn: All right. I should begin, I suppose, by saying what my own preference would be. I am afraid my preference would be that we keep Canada the way it is. Unfortunately, if we take a look at the opinion polls that are coming out of Quebec and the reports that are coming out, the Allaire report already published and the one set up by the Quebec government which will be coming along in another month, it would appear that majority opinion in Quebec favours separation, and I believe there is no disposition in Canada to hold Quebec forcibly. Therefore we must do some very serious thinking about what we will do if the day arrives when Quebec in fact says, "We wish to secede."

It is true that there is no constitutional mechanism for this and therefore we will face a serious crisis. What I think we have to do is prepare some careful contingency plans so that if this should arise—I hope it does not but I think it will—we will be prepared with some kind of counter-proposals that will preserve as much of what we value as possible and which will prevent the situation running out of hand.

I am led to go back to some ideas that were propounded by Mr Stanfield when he was leader of the Conservative Party and a suggestion, I might say, which divided the Conservative Party itself at that time, and that is the idea of two nations. I think we have to be a little tolerant in looking at this and not jump to rapid conclusions. What is meant by this is that there are two separate linguistic, cultural communities in Canada which are distinct geographically and, that being the case, if one of them wishes a constitutional relationship with the other which is strikingly different from what prevails, we must be prepared to deal with this and to deal with it seriously.

That suggests to me that we should be willing to consider this but we should not allow it to permit us to destroy the country we know, the federal system we have or the union we have among English Canadians. In other words, it will be a different kind of bond between Quebec and Canada than there is between other English-speaking provinces. I think, if we are willing to face up to this and be understanding in negotiating an arrangement, we can create a situation where nobody suffers.

This suggests what the current jargon would call asymmetrical federalism, that is to say, where there is a kind of unity between a larger and a smaller partner, and this is always very difficult. English Canada has three times the population of Quebec and more than three times the wealth of Quebec and therefore can be forgiven, I suppose, for saying, "We're not going to give them complete equality."

That means we have to find another way to live together. I was wondering how we are going to do this so we can live together, like France lives beside Belgium or Canada lives beside the United States, the big guy beside the small guy. It does not mean they both have to be, in every sense, equal. I finally found a parallel that I think might help us.

If you go back to 1867 it is a big year in Canadian history, but it was also a big year in the history of the Austrian empire. It is taking it a long way from Canada, I know, but they had the same kind of problem. The Hungarians decided they wanted to secede; the Austrians did not want them to, but they did not want to fight about it either. So they finally discussed the matter and came to an agreement. The agreement was that Hungary would have a separate monarchy and a separate Parliament and Austria would have a separate Parliament as well. They would look after their own affairs separately but some things would be held in common: There would be a common financial arrangement and there would be a common military establishment and there would be a common bank and customs arrangements and that sort of thing. To handle this, they used the custom duties to fund the common

enterprise and supplement it by funds collected by taxes from each part.

The Chair: Mr Thorburn, I am going to have to ask you to sum up.

Dr Thorburn: I will just complete what I am saying if I may. The Austrians were 70%, the Hungarians 30%, so this is the way they divided the financial responsibility to service this common administration. That suggests to me that we might do something like that. I am not suggesting that we copy it at all—the differences are enormous. But the point is that we should start thinking about arrangements that will allow this kind of devolution of power to the two sides and at the same time permit harmony to reign and to permit the kind of co-existence without necessarily meaning that in every sense the two parts are equal. I would be happy to discuss any of these points if anyone wants to.

The Chair: You put some interesting notions before us, and I am sure they would be interested in getting into some questions, but, given the time, we are going to have to press on and hear the other speakers. Thank you very much, both of you.

2100

NEIL DUKAS

The Chair: Could I invite next Neil Dukas.

Mr Dukas: Kenneth McNaught once wrote, "The assumption that order must underlie both liberty and justice is fundamental to Canadian political and social ideas." I agree with this premise. Canada, throughout its history, has stood for the rejection of revolution as a political philosophy. Peace, order and good government was the cornerstone of Canadian parliamentary democracy and the tie that bound.

We have not remained true to our original principles in two major respects. First, we have allowed the political order of this country to decline as a direct consequence of having failed to assert the paramouncy of Parliament. Second, our political leadership has failed to provide the good government that was required to maintain that order.

Although the courts may from time to time have ruled otherwise, there can be no doubt that politically the Fathers of Confederation sought to create one nation with a strong central government. The provincial legislatures were created merely to avoid micro-management by the central authority. A series of federal governments, however, have given away the candy shop and fumbled in their duty to maintain institutions revered by all Canadians as intrinsic to the national fabric.

I have said in other forums that I believe serious consideration should be given to calling a constitutional convention in which we could publicly and democratically debate all proposed constitutional models. In view of our Prime Minister's recent statements, however, I see little hope of this ever occurring.

Returning, then, to Ontario's role in all this, if I am to believe the newspaper reports, the popular sentiment in Ontario is clearly against decentralization, and if that means Quebec leaves Confederation, then so be it. Ontario will continue to exist no matter which route we choose;

and I might add that Alaska has no interest in joining Canada, despite not being contiguous with the United States. My point is, let's not be fatalistic about the future of the maritime provinces within Confederation.

Ontarians have always felt they were simply Canadians. By defining ourselves in no other way, we have left ourselves in an awkward position. If Canada was to break up tomorrow, would we, as Tom Courchene suggested, end up being Americans simply because there is no alternative? I am inclined to say that our sense of Canadian identity could not change. We have too much faith in our own destiny to let that happen.

In contemplating such a scenario, one must acknowledge the perceived danger of Ontario dominating what remains of Confederation. The only way I can think of alleviating such fears is by going ahead with the plan to convert the Senate to a House of Provinces. It is the only rational way of ensuring that provinces such as PEI and even the territories can have a voice beyond the meagre number of seats allocated to them in the Commons. I personally do not support the triple E concept. I would rather have the provincial government appoint its representatives and see to it that these representatives hold their seats in the upper House only as long as their sponsoring government remains in office.

The maritime provinces have endured economic underdevelopment and high unemployment for far too long. The west simply views Ottawa as the agent of central Canada. Regional development, east, west and the north, has grave economic and political implications for the future of this country, and in my opinion has to be brought to the top of our political agenda. Ontario must take a leading role in bringing this to happen.

I will only say this about official bilingualism. If our governments had limited the number of grand gestures and kept the process balanced and reasonable, I do not think bilingualism would be an issue today. Last week was Ontario Heritage Week. Even TVOntario failed to give it any notice. We go on blaming the federal government for having failed to induce a sense of Canadian nationalism, but the Ontario government is just as culpable in its own jurisdiction.

Our provincial motto is "Loyal it began, loyal it remains." It is about time we had it officially translated into English so that Ontarians can understand and appreciate the significance of our loyalist roots. Maybe we could even put it on our licence plates.

Ontarians say we value our parliamentary heritage, but we keep the Lieutenant Governor out of sight and out of mind. This may sound facetious, but let's put the Lieutenant Governor in Casa Loma as an official residence. It would be of great value for tourism and would bring that most noble of public offices into the daylight where we can all see it.

Last month, the provincial government abolished the office of sheriff and replaced it with something called the Ontario court services manager. This represents the end of an institution in this province which can be traced back to at least the Magna Carta. I am the last one to stand in the way of progress, but surely this title could have been accommodated within the confines of its new function. Borroughs

have given way to cities. Counties are making way for regional municipalities. Reeves and wardens are apparently next on the hit list. I am told that it is because at municipal conventions Americans do not realize what wardens are. This reminds me of a recent attempt by one US auto maker to have Ontario auto workers change the date of our Thanksgiving holiday to match their own. They thought we were disrupting their production schedule.

If education is a provincial responsibility, why is it that Ontario history is so terribly neglected in our public schools? I have my doubts about the number of Ontario schoolchildren who realize the Mohawks in Ontario were Loyalists. The United States is said to have borrowed directly from the Iroquois Confederacy in the process of shaping its own Constitution. How can we expect our children to grow up respecting the place native people have in our society if we make no mention of these achievements?

While we may have a well-defined economic aim, I find there is a certain lack of cultural *raison d'être* for this province. It distresses me that we are doing so little to refresh our memories. If we are to remain Canadians and Ontarians, we must look again at who and what we are. This committee's hearings are a good start. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. We will carry on.

RAYMOND ROBERTS

Mr Roberts: Mr Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to speak. The word is "equality." The Franco-Ontarians want more rights than the original natives to this land. French should be just another language, like German, Italian, etc. To give the French language official status makes second-class citizens of the rest of us, especially the ethnic groups. We all pay the same taxes.

This brings me to another point. Why should Franco-Ontarians be funded by federal and provincial governments when English-speaking Ontarians receive no funds for their associations? Over a period of time in Quebec, 450,000 English-speaking Quebecers have left Quebec. Why? Because of harassment, the language police. It reminds me of all the East Germans who left East Germany for West Germany to escape socialism.

Here are some documented facts of what French Canadian leaders have said. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, 1966, when he was parliamentary secretary to Lester Pearson: "There is no way two ethnic groups in one country can be made equal before the law...and to say it is possible is to sow the seeds of destruction." Jules Léger, 1968, in a luncheon speech on his departure for his position as ambassador to France, said, "The Canadian government is now engaged in a national task of spreading the French language across the length and breadth of this country,"—*Montreal Gazette*, 29 October 1968.

Leo Cadieux, 1973, ambassador to France, speaking to the National Assembly: "Canada is going to be a French-speaking nation from coast to coast, and anyone who is opposed to this is opposed to the best interests of Canada." Serge Joyal, November 1982, the Secretary of State for Canada: "Everything we undertake and everything we are doing to make Canada a French state is part of a venture I have shared for many years with a number of people. The

idea, the challenge of making Canada a French country, both inside and outside Quebec...an idea that some people consider a bit crazy...is something a little beyond the ordinary imagination."

Lucien Bouchard, June 1988, Secretary of State: "Bill 72 is intended to promote the interests of francophone minorities. The English-speaking Quebecers do not need protection." Robert Bourassa, 1988, Premier of Quebec: "Bilingualism is unthinkable for Quebec."

2110

According to our local newspaper, the Whig-Standard, and subtitled "Socialist Housing Policy Anti-middle-class and Racist": "Speaking of subsidized housing, have you heard the latest? The president of the new Residence Richelieu in Windsor has succeeded in having this building declared a French-only apartment complex. This is a non-profit housing complex subsidized by a government grant, and 10 of the building's 51 units were open for referrals from the Windsor Housing Authority. That body located people by need, which is only fair when taxpayers' money is involved. The Minister of Housing has given his consent to this act of racism and bigotry."

We have segregation in the school system. Now we have segregation in housing. What are we going to get segregation in next? Do not talk about South Africa.

When John Diefenbaker was Prime Minister, the national debt was nearly non-existent. After two terms in office of that great fellow Trudeau, the national debt soared to \$190 billion, money spent on promotion of French and money to his communist friends—dictator Castro.

I think the slogan for Canada should be, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

AUBREY GARRETT

The Chair: Aubrey Garrett, go ahead.

Mr Garrett: Mr Chairman, committee members, distinguished Canadians, I appreciate this opportunity to express my thoughts on who will speak for Ontario in this time of crisis. I say it is a crisis not because Quebec is leaving, but because no one is speaking for the Greeks, the Jews, the Brits, the Scots, the Ukrainians and the Italians, all the groups that make up the race we know as Canadians, that make up the culture we know as Canadians.

This is who we are. We are displaced persons. I took a little look at my family history. If you want to tell me to go home where I belong to, if I go back to Israel, they will say, "We don't recognize the rights of the Reform rabbis." If I go to Holland, they are going to tell me, "You'd better get yourself some wooden shoes and learn to speak Dutch." If I go back to Britain, they are going to say: "You colonials are a bunch of radicals anyway. Could you please go back where you belong?" This is where I belong. I belong in Ontario. I am a Canadian. But who is speaking up for us?

We have an example: Down in Quebec, the Prime Minister pointed to the billions of dollars being funneled from Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia into the province of Quebec. They are known as transfer payments. I heard a

figure a little earlier from a speaker, \$4.6 billion. But distinguished Canadians from Ontario, Alberta or British Columbia are saying to the maritime provinces, to the two poorer prairie provinces: "These moneys will continue be in the form of transfer payments. They will go to you and they'll help you and we'll still maintain a very strong Canada." Instead we have total silence.

In the recent past we have seen the CF-18 fighter jets taken from Manitoba and put into Montreal. We have seen the space agency shipped from Ottawa into Montreal. Here in Kingston, the Bell helicopter plant in Kingston was on the short list, Kingston and Peterborough. Everything was shaping up good, the first helicopter plant to be built in Canada, and then the cabinet stepped in and told that company from Texas: "If you want Canadian taxpayer money, you'd better set it up in Quebec." And if you want to see the plant that was built, you had better start heading east to take a look at it.

Here in Kingston, a secretive building permit was issued and a plant was built. Lo and behold, a company from Quebec moved in in almost the wee hours of the morning. J. and P. Coats came into Kingston in that fashion. It was almost like an East German crossing the Berlin wall late at night to escape what he was leaving behind.

Enforced bilingualism, first on the federal level and now through Bill 8 on the provincial level—please notice I am saying "enforced" bilingualism; I do not object to bilingualism—and now we are going to have it, I believe, at the municipal level. The politicians say I am wrong. No, it is your chance to tell me why I am wrong.

In Bill 8, clause 8(1)(b) says: "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations...amending the schedule by adding areas to it." If I look at the schedule at the back of Bill 8, there are all the lists that are official bilingual in Ontario.

Then I go to section 16 in Bill 8. The whole section applies to municipalities. There is a pamphlet put out by the Office of Francophone Affairs. It is called *The Facts* and it says: "areas where francophones form 10% of the population or urban centres where they number at least 5,000." These are the areas we are concerned about. The Kingston Whig-Standard said there are approximately 4,000 to 4,500 francophones in this area. Does that mean that when we have 500 more Kingston becomes official bilingual and all that is involved in enforced bilingualism in the job site? It is in the job site that I object to, the enforcement of it.

Maybe I am misreading Bill 8, but in Hansard from 1 November 1986, when Bill 8 was passed, Mr Shymko said: "Thanks to the recommendations and amendments from this side of the House, the municipal level has been included in the sectors required to offer French-language services. I congratulate the government on the fact that the municipalities have been included among the organizations required to offer services in the French language." Bob Rae said: "These are important measures and I take some pride in the fact that thanks to two of our amendments, one regarding the municipalities, one regarding the rights of the individuals, we are going to guarantee the people the right to challenge the government before the

urts." I suggest to you that Bob Rae has declared his own view, his own bias, when it comes to bilingualism. So Bob Rae cannot speak for all of Ontario.

The Chair: Sir, you are going to have to sum up.

Mr Garrett: All right. What has taken place across Canada? We have seen Premier Getty go down to personal defeat. He signed Meech Lake. We have seen Hatfield, Rockford, Peterson, Pawley go down to personal defeat. We have seen John Buchanan put in a safe place where he will never go down to defeat. Mr Devine and Joe Ghiz, look out. Bill Vander Zalm, if he ever calls an election, he will just better hang on.

I ask these two questions: Who speaks for English Canada? It is a real concern of mine. The second question: Do we want to live with the type of leadership we have seen in Canada in the last 20 years or do we want to live in democracy? Thank you for your patience.

The Chair: Before I proceed to the next speaker, Mr Beer wanted to make a comment with respect to Bill 8, I believe.

Mr Beer: I just want to reply to the question about Bill 8, having, as the speaker perhaps knows, been responsible for its implementation over the last couple of years. I want to underline that the reference to municipalities in Bill 8 is "may." The reason that reference is there is that there are some 50 or 60 municipalities in Ontario that have passed bilingual bylaws where they provide some or all of their services in both languages, and the provision of the "may" is simply to ensure that that is legal, that a municipality may do that, but no municipality in Ontario is under any obligation to do that. The references in Hansard were to including in the bill the permissive clause, the "may" clause, so that those municipalities which themselves voted to do so would be able to provide those services in both languages. That is why that is there, but municipalities are not forced at all by Bill 8 to provide services in both English and French.

MARIA HEISSLER

The Chair: Ms Heissler?

Mrs Heissler: I follow about 10 or 12 men. The subject is to save Canada, and I have a woman's view on the save-Canada thing. I would first like to thank Premier Bob Rae for allowing our voice to be heard.

If we should continue on the downhill path we have been following for the last three decades, a remedy to save Canada has to be quickly applied or we shall go under as former civilizations have done under similar circumstances. The values of our forebears are widely regarded as outmoded. Instead, we have accepted so-called new morality, which is in fact nothing more than the old immorality. The old values were based on the premise that God exists and that He has established a certain law and order so that social groups, big or small, might function. The new morality is based on the assumption that God does not exist. As a result, secular humanism makes new laws to do away with proven order. It tries to brainwash society into believing them and so change its attitudes, bringing us all by the minute closer to disaster.

2120

A country is only as strong as its families. Destroy the family and you destroy the nation. Every child has a right to grow up in a family with a father and a mother. Our government, by new laws, promotes the breakup of marriages and therefore of families by undermining the solid base these institutions were founded on.

Motherhood is considered an inferior state of womanhood. The mother at home is discriminated against. Her many duties are not accepted as valuable work, and the tax system has a way of punishing her. Fatherhood has as well fallen victim to new attitudes. The equality craze no longer considers it is acceptable for a man to be the sole provider and protector of his loved ones.

A true mother plays a major role in nation-building by raising her children with basic moral and practical values. Together with her husband, she teaches a sense of responsibility. Here is a word—responsibility—which is being removed from our vocabulary. I strongly suggest that some straight-thinking lawmakers come up very promptly with a charter of responsibilities to preserve our rights and freedoms. We are to be concerned about the loss of human life in the Persian Gulf, but more frightening is the phenomenal loss of human life right here at home. Between Canada and the United States we kill nearly two and a half million humans annually by abortion. Moreover, we have the nerve to call it our right. Worse yet is that some of our honourable members at Queen's Park see this paramount evil as their top priority—to be implemented, furthermore, at taxpayers' expense.

The royal law commission of Canada has a book out entitled *Crimes Against the Foetus*. Whatever is a crime is punishable. If you legalize one, then logically you should legalize the others. Would that not be a frightening prospect?

Much is said about the environment and pollution control. The worst pollution is mind pollution, and our Charter of Rights allows it to progress full speed, especially to our youths. As an environmentalist myself, let me assure you that unless you stop this mind pollution, you will not stop the other ones. As a comment on our welfare system, I suggest that we get all the idle hands in Canada, and there are not enough for the overwhelming task, to work physically to improve the environment by planting trees, operating woodlots, cleaning up fresh water bodies. As Canadians, we have probably broken a record by polluting the world's biggest fresh water resource with the smallest number of people. Other important projects would be creating parks, bicycle trails, rebuilding and modernizing our railway system.

Work will in turn create more work. Idle land and idle hands go hand in hand. We cannot all be white-collar workers. It is ridiculous that we, at our high rate of unemployment, still have to import workers at harvest time. Apparently, it is our human right to refuse to use our muscles other than in aerobics classes or exercise machines or golf courses. Meanwhile, we still consider that somebody owes us a living, so our government becomes our nurturing parent, provides our needs, and up, up go our taxes and our national debt.

On a positive note, it is late but it is not too late. I plead with all Canadians to help rebuild Canada by returning to proven values. I plead with the people in government to rule by the same proven values. For the love of this country, for the health and wellbeing of the country, please reverse your present philosophies and do all in your power to restore the healthy family.

The Chair: Thank you, madam.

Mrs Heissler: I have a few recommendations. Do you have time?

The Chair: We are beyond the time already.

Mrs Heissler: Okay. I hope you read them. I had a resolution I put before the federation of agriculture in 1988, and it was unanimously accepted by the whole 400 people present. I will send it to you to Queen's Park.

The Chair: Or if you want to leave a copy with our clerk, we can get copies made, if you wish. Thank you.

DAVID SWITZER

The Chair: David Switzer, and following that I will call Bruce Vowles.

Mr Switzer: What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada? The Fathers of Confederation never intended Canada to become bilingual. As I understand it, the province of Quebec was to be bilingual and the rest of Canada was to be unilingual English. The federal government has spent billions of dollars cramming French down our throats. Bilingualism is one of the largest contributors to our huge national debt. Now Ontario is cramming French down our throats with its infamous Bill 8 and its threat to make Ontario bilingual.

I do not want to see any more English and French signs; no more government documents in both languages. We need the hundreds of millions that are being wasted on bilingualism here in Ontario to be spent on hospitals and schools, etc. This has always been a unilingual English province, and I want it to stay that way. Repeal Bill 8.

"What is Quebec's future in Canada?"

The province of Quebec will not fly the Canadian flag on its legislative buildings in Quebec City. Bill 178 makes it unlawful to put up an exterior English sign in the province of Quebec. What a slap in the face of English-speaking Canadians?

I would like to see Canada stay together. If Quebec wants to stay in Canada, it must become just another province, no better or worse than the other nine, no distinct society. They must honour and respect our national flag. It must be flown on every provincial legislative and government building in Canada. And Bill 178 must be repealed.

If Quebec decides to separate, we must let it know that the rest of Canada will no longer be Mr Nice Guy—no sovereignty-association. Quebec must pay its share of the national debt. All of the northern part of Quebec, historically known as Rupert's Land, must be returned to Canada, and Quebec must reimburse Canada for all federally financed roads, bridges, buildings, etc.

"What are the values we share as Canadians?"

Multiculturalism: When people want to immigrate to Canada, they should be told:

1. We are historically a Judaeo-Christian nation.
2. In nine out of the 10 provinces, English is the working language, and new Canadians must be encouraged to learn English as soon as possible.
3. Our armed forces, RCMP and police forces, etc. have their dress codes that must be adhered to by everyone in said forces—no turbans and ceremonial sword.
4. Not one nickel of taxpayers' money to be spent on multicultural events or teaching these languages, as proposed by another infamous piece of provincial legislation, namely, Bill 5.

Now as to being a Judaeo-Christian nation, the public of Ontario should take the lead for the rest of Canada on moral issues. Prayer and Bible-reading should be returned to all the public school systems even if we have to enact the notwithstanding clause to do it. Quebec sure was shy about enacting the notwithstanding clause for Bill 178. Surely we can do the same for Christian education.

Sunday must be returned as a day of worship and rest. All stores, except for essential services, must be closed.

2130

Two homosexuals living together should not be recognized as a family. Historically our province has acknowledged homosexuality as a perverse and immoral lifestyle. Our province is making a big mistake by forcing the citizens of this province to put our stamp of approval on homosexuality.

Our province should do everything it can to protect the weakest and most vulnerable citizens. We should take the lead for the rest of Canada in protecting the unborn from the evil called abortion. Instead of spending millions of taxpayers' dollars building free-standing abortion clinics, we should be encouraging mothers to have their babies.

The following quotes are from the greatest book ever written, namely, the Holy Bible: (1) "The nation or kingdom that will not serve you will perish. It will be utterly ruined." (2) "Righteousness exalts a nation but sin is a reproach to any people." (3) "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

BRUCE VOWLES

The Chair: Bruce Vowles? Following Mr Vowles will be calling Anne Bordeau.

Mr Vowles: The main thrust of my presentation is in the area of communication. Lack of adequate communication causes misunderstanding and dissension. I believe we have fallen into the trap of failing to communicate properly among ourselves and misunderstanding has followed, creating a pack of constitutional problems.

In considering these problems, I believe we must go back to basics and ask ourselves what our needs are as individuals in society, what our objectives are, and articulate clearly the rules and legislative structures required to satisfy these needs and achieve our objectives.

First, as a society of human beings, what are our individual needs. In addition to such basics as adequate food, shelter, clothing and health care, a list of basic needs for everyone should include the acceptance and respect of the community of people in which one lives, and the opportunity of achievement in an area of freely chosen activity.

Second, as a society, what are our objectives? To identify appropriate set of our objectives consistent with these needs, we need to look no farther than the writing on the walls of this Memorial Hall, in everlasting remembrance of those from this city who fought in defence of justice and liberty. The objectives of justice and liberty have been with us for a long time and may be considered as accepted. However we need to review them and rededicate ourselves to them constantly.

Third, as a society, what do we need in the way of rules and legislative structures? We have developed and embraced representative government based on the British model as being the best means of achieving the objectives of justice and liberty in our society. With representative government, the people have the opportunity and the responsibility to see to it that they have competent individuals presenting them in the legislative body and governing machinery.

We have representative government in our land and I do not believe we have a marked tendency to consciously deliberately elect known scoundrels or obvious incompetents to our legislatures. We have a very high quality of civil service. Too high a head count, maybe, given the size of the economy, but very good nevertheless, probably among the best in the world.

Why then are we having problems? A reasonably well informed public opinion and support is necessary to the working of a representative government, in dealing with issues that arise in the public domain. This is virtually impossible to achieve in a multicultural society such as Canada's, unless there is a lively commitment by all groups to clearly identify common objectives such as justice and liberty, accompanied by a good fellow feeling between the groups.

Although the objectives of justice and liberty are accepted in Canada, good fellow feelings have taken quite a beating in recent times. I believe this is because a significant divergence of opinion has developed on how our society should be organized for the achievement of these objectives. The development of this divergence of opinion accompanied by misunderstanding, which is communication-related, and this brings me to the one major point I wish to make in this presentation.

We must have better communication at all levels between all the groups of our country, especially between the two major groups. The volume and quality of information flow and idea exchange and general dialogue between the francophone citizens of Quebec and the rest of the country is at a very low level. In a land which claims to be civilized, this is downright disgraceful, and lipservice to improving matters is just not good enough.

During the anguish of the Meech Lake debate, why did Premier Bourassa cry out that the rest of Canada does not understand Quebec? I believe a lack of communication, especially at the grass-roots level, has created the situation causing this agonized outburst. There is no doubt that outside pressures on Quebec's language and culture are severe, especially those pressures from the United States. It is unlikely Quebec can withstand these pressures successfully all by itself, even by imposing severe and possibly dictatorial repression and isolation on its people in the area

of communication. Improved communication between our two groups will contribute to a better understanding and to the generation of ideas which will help solve Quebec's dilemma and our mutual problem.

At the same time, it must be emphasized that good communication is a two-way street. If the rest of Canada shows evidence of not understanding Quebec, it is reasonable to inquire whether Quebec really understands the rest of Canada and its deep-rooted fear and distaste of any intrusion on the legitimate liberty of the individual in the area of self-expression.

In order to ensure a climate in which justice and liberty will flourish in our society, communication of information and ideas at all levels must be complete and promoted in an even-handed fashion throughout the land. If we do not understand each other, how can we live together under the same canopy?

The Chair: Mr Vowles, will you sum up please?

Mr Vowles: Right away. In my view, the responsibility for the means of communication must remain with the central government. Surrender of this function to the provinces, or even to one province, will constitute a tremendous boost to the balkanization and even the complete breakup of Canada. Good communication is the glue which must be present to hold this country together. Placing this responsibility in the hands of the central government in no way implies censorship of the interchange and delivery of information and ideas. It does imply the responsibility of the central government to ensure that adequate communication systems can exist and function without provincial interference, and that there is unfettered opportunity for the even-handed delivery of information and ideas to the public in every section of Canada.

In this connection, it is my view that the Ontario government's role in Confederation in this matter should be active and vigorous support of the central government's responsibility for information and communication throughout Canada.

During this presentation my emphasis has been on the communication of ideas and information, because it is the obvious need for all of us to understand each other better and to be more keenly aware of each other's needs and aspirations. I would add that communication by definition really should also include transportation in all its forms; that is, regulation of the systems required to move goods and people. If you really work at it, improved communications should bring better understanding and enhancement of the good fellow feeling so necessary to the functioning of the central government.

2140

ANNE BORDEAU

The Chair: Could I invite Anne Bordeau to come forward, and following that I will call on Jason Balgopal.

Mrs Bordeau: I represent myself, an English-speaking Canadian distressed at what is happening to our country. I would be more at peace if blindly I trusted politicians and others and did not try to be informed, but I read three newspapers each day and two on Sundays, and much of

what I read distresses me. I have a few points and then I will try to summarize quickly with some newspaper articles, because I am a newspaper reader; they say it much better than I ever could.

Those who lament the failure of Meech Lake will not get any agreement from me. We must keep the current three-year amending procedure because this provision was the one that allowed Canadians to realize just what was being done to their Constitution. We hear much talk in high circles that this must go. I say, "No, I do not think I am going." The Meech Lake accord failed not because of the three-year time limit, but because it was a bad deal. It ignored our aboriginal people and our northern territories. The "distinct society" clause was ambiguous. It was interpreted in Quebec as giving to that province all the power it would need in the future. Bourassa said so. He said if he had had Meech Lake he would not have needed the notwithstanding clause, while in the rest of Canada it was interpreted as a simple statement of an obvious reality conferring no additional powers on Quebec.

The so-called five minimums—I am sorry, do I just—when I point my pencil?

The Chair: No, go ahead.

Mrs Bordeau: It is indicative of how strongly I feel.

The Chair: No, you go right ahead, madam.

Mrs Bordeau: The so-called five minimum demands of Quebec contained in Meech were first presented as simply one of several campaign positions for Bourassa's Liberals in 1985 in the Quebec election. The author is quoted as saying, "It was never expected that English Canada would accept these demands." Now we have the Allaire report which would destroy the Canada so many of us love.

Because we did accept the five minimum demands and you know the performance that went on there. They were turned down and they come back with the Allaire report, which is what? You name it, ten times as strong. I resent the statements from Quebec that it is going to give Canada one more chance. Thanks, but no thanks.

The rest of Canada has been silent too long. Now that there is finally an expression of some kind of collective resistance in English-speaking Canada to Quebec's demands we also finally have a slight change to the beginning of a conciliatory tone out of Quebec. You know what I refer to, the business community is saying, "Federalism is not all that bad," and so on. So I come to the newspaper articles and how am I doing on time?

The Chair: You have a few more minutes left.

Mrs Bordeau: Okay, this is an article by Peter Trueman. I am not only a newspaper reader; I am clipping newspapers. I almost have to give one room in the house over to my clippings. Peter Trueman is responding to some of the press reports in Montreal in the Montreal Gazette, *Le Droit*—and I will not read it—and *La Presse*. This is an article from 5 December 1990, not all that long ago wherein these writers, and I have to interpret, were saying that the rest of Canada is in a state of adolescence. I think the conclusion you are to come to is that they are in a state of sophistication, etc, and this is Peter Trueman's response and I start from here down.

"What Quebecers and perhaps many other Canadians do not yet understand is that it is because Canada has tried to be all things to all people that it is in trouble. If it is, *La Presse* put it, 'so divided by divergent aspirations, torn between its attachment to the status quo and its desire for change, so confused as to its identity, and so paralyzed by its political struggles' then the reason is generosity, not selfishness.

"English Canada today would be as single-minded as Quebec if, like Quebec, it had proclaimed itself unilingual and unicultural and had tried to enhance its own political power at the expense of the other participating entities in Confederation. Lucien Bouchard"—get this one, remember well—"the leader of the Bloc québécois in the Commons recently made a penetrating comment about what has to be faced.

"The minute we recognize English-speaking Canadians as well as French-speaking Canadians right to a country they want, Canada is no longer possible."

I am sorry to say that I think many English Canadians are also coming around to that way of thinking. Quebec perhaps should understand and deliberate accordingly.

I have two others. I will quit. Thank you very much.

JASON BALGOPAL

The Chair: Jason Balgopal and next I will be calling Alex Craig.

Mr Balgopal: Ladies and gentlemen, I would really like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to present my views on how Ontario should participate in Confederation. I have given a copy of my outline of this presentation to the clerk and I hope the Chair has it.

I would like to divide this into a problem and a solution. I feel the problem itself of what Canada is right now is divided into two parts:

First, a feeling of national unity, which I would like to divide into Quebec wishing extra powers and the Maritimes and the west wishing greater recognition at the federal level. Each province is controlling so much power right now that the people associate easier with their provincial governments than they do with the federal government and multiculturalism.

Second, the competitiveness of Canada in the global markets. Our technological level, our work ethic, our education, the debt and foreign investment all relate to this.

Even though most of these problems are problems that the federal government should handle, I feel that Ontario should provide as much assistance as necessary in order to ensure that solutions are met.

With regard to the first problem, the problem of national unity, I firmly believe that every group of people has the right to determine its own destiny within its own country. Therefore, I think that if Quebecers wish to separate, it is up to them to decide and it is their right. However, I do not want there to be any half measures. If Quebec wishes to separate, then let it separate, but let us not have sovereignty association; let us not share a currency; let us not have a common debt, and let us not have a central bank. I am Canadian and I wish those to remain my items. Where Quebec wishes to separate, let them have their own.

If Quebec decides to stay in Canada, then on the basis that all people are equal, Quebec should be accorded the same powers as all other provinces, no more and no less, and should act accordingly. As far as the economy goes, if Quebec separates, I think that Quebec should reimburse Canada for all the federal buildings and other works owned by the government of Canada and should also assume its portion of the national debt.

I do not believe that any special provisions relating to the exchange of goods would need to be adopted, except to the extent that I think goods and services and people should be allowed to freely pass from Canada to Quebec and Quebec to Canada. In that way, people will be able to travel from the western part of what would be Canada to the eastern part through Quebec and vice versa. It seems to work reasonably well for the Americans to travel up to Alaska, and Hawaii has not sunk into the ocean, so I think Canada would be equally capable of handling that.

As far as attacking the problem of the Maritimes and the west wishing greater recognition at the federal level, which is what I believe is their desire, I feel that the Senate needs to be reformed into a triple E body. This in itself I feel would do a great deal to rectify the problem of not feeling in control.

I do not feel any more power should be accorded to the provinces. The federal government should reassume any and all federal powers which it has allowed to fall into provincial domains. Because the provinces have slowly, through increased revenue, increased power, grown bigger and stronger, people relate easier to their provincial governments than they do to the federal government. That does not breed a national unity, a sense of national will. That breeds a provincial sense of will.

As far as multiculturalism goes, I would like to see immigrants have a sense of loyalty to Canada and with the heritage that they bring to Canada add to the Canadian identity. I do not want them just to live here and stay loyal to the country they left; nor do I want their culture to be another ours.

My father was born in India. He came to Canada 30 years ago and became a Canadian. I am a Canadian. I was born in Canada and I am very proud to be a Canadian. I am proud of my Indian, my Finnish, my German and my Swiss ancestry; however, I am foremost a Canadian. What I have learned of my ancestry was taught at home. As many Canadians, my father came to Canada to be a Canadian. He did not come to Canada to be an Indian living in Canada.

I therefore believe that the government programs designed to keep people immersed in the culture which they have voluntarily left are counterproductive to the goals of our society. Canada has a culture of its own. Part of that culture is being Canadian while remembering your roots. In making the choice to live in Canada, immigrants are giving up their old culture in favour of our new one. To spend money on multicultural programs is divisive and could stop; however, legislation which allows people to add from their heritage to our mosaic without smothering our culture should definitely be encouraged.

The Chair: Mr Balgopal, you could sum up, please?

Mr Balgopal: Yes. The second problem I mentioned was that of the economy. As you see in the briefs you have, there are various points which I wanted to make. Obviously, I do not have time, but I think, in conclusion, that we should commit ourselves to increasing our research and development, commit ourselves to educating our children at a greater level so that they can be competitive, encourage people to be productive in this world, in Canada, by reducing the national debt and deficit so that we allow ourselves to freely go without the burden of having 34 cents on every dollar being paid to foreigners on interest, and reduce the foreign investment so that Canadian companies may flourish of their own accord. I think these problems are the ones which directly affect Canada today and I believe these solutions would help put Canada back on a vision that I would like to see. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

ALEX CRAIG

The Chair: Alex Craig. Following Mr Craig, I will be calling Harry Pasternak.

Mr Craig: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to address bilingualism as the main topic. Early in the 20th century a French writer, Albert Dauzat, wrote, "Bilingualism is the transitory stage from one language to another." This truism is well understood in the province of Quebec. That province has no time for bilingualism in any form or shape. Canada's misguided commitment to bilingualism has had Quebec thumb its nose at it with the introduction of Bill 101, Quebec's official language law. This bill, together with its language Gestapo and informers, is the most repressive legislation in the free world and it is not only tolerated but condoned by the federal government of Canada.

Many have asked, "What does Quebec want from Canada?" I believe Quebec wants complete control and manipulation of its population and, further to that, it wants its emissaries sent to every part of Canada to agitate, to infiltrate, to dominate and demand French services until French becomes Canada's only official language. Quebec says: "Don't ask us what we want. Ask English Canada what it wants." I cannot speak for Canada, but as a Canadian, what I want for Canada is unity: one people, one official language, one country.

French Quebecers are the only segment of Canada's present population who have proved themselves unwilling to integrate, unwilling to participate in Canada's future unless Canada becomes Quebec and we all live and work entirely in French.

Today, Canada's overriding problem is a deficit of \$400 billion. This deficit was brought upon us by successive governments committed to bilingualism or, more correctly, the Frenchification of Canada. Translation and duplication of all federal services, provincial services and now local and municipal services have added and compounded our debt. The moving of bilingual French families all over Canada to fill artificial bilingual jobs, as well as the forming of French pressure groups to agitate and demand French services out of all proportion to any actual

need, all of this costs Canadians the highest taxation level in the free world.

Not only have our French-led governments legislated and enforced French into every aspect of our lives, they have shown Canada and the world the nasty, double-dealing way in which we are governed or, more correctly, sold out to pressure groups.

The Meech Lake fiasco was typical of this underhand, malignant way of working. Thank God for people like Elijah Harper and Clyde Wells who, despite political differences, still put honesty and integrity above party alliances. Honesty and integrity, those rare qualities in our political system, have to be revived. Since politicians cannot be trusted, a system of representation of the views of Canadians must be introduced both at the federal and provincial government levels.

When any Prime Minister of Canada can manipulate by hook and by crook and ram through legislation such as the GST bill in the face of the disapproval of 85% of Canadians from coast to coast, it is nothing short of dictatorship. In fact, since Mr Trudeau bastardized our parliamentary system to rule by order in council, it has rendered members of Parliament to the status of an overpaid high school debating team, totally impotent to change any legislation whatsoever.

The Chair: Mr Craig, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Craig: Canadians have only one chance in every four or five years to decide who our next dictator will be. I suggest we in Ontario introduce legislation to make all MPs and MPPs accountable to their constituents rather than to the party. If a representative cannot or will not represent the views of his constituents, then he should be forced to resign and a by-election held to replace him. With this, there should be a total abolition of the position of party whips in all parties, thereby removing pressure from MPs to conform to party lines when they know legislation is not acceptable to their constituents.

Next, I would have a referendum on Bill 8 to find out if the individual Ontarian's view as to whether he or she wants or needs and wants to pay for services in French.

The Chair: Mr Craig, you are going to have to conclude, sir.

Mr Craig: Thank you very much, sir. I think I have made my main points. I appreciate your time.

The Chair: All right. Thank you.

HARRY PASTERNAK

The Chair: Harry Pasternak. Following Mr Pasternak, I am going to call John Dowling and I think that unfortunately we are probably going to have to end at that point.

Mr Pasternak: I have spoken at several commissions. The speakers never have a water jug, never have a glass. I think that is fairly symbolic maybe of what the expectation is really from the speaker.

The Chair: Actually, we have had water at our hearings regularly for the speakers. This is the first time that we do not have it for some reason or other.

Mr Pasternak: I was originally supposed to talk for 30 minutes. Now I have five minutes and I was thinking maybe of just giving every fifth word and going through that way, but I decided it would probably make too much sense if I did that, so I have taken about four points out of it and I am going to talk about those four points. Hopefully I will add something useful to your research.

I am going to swear on this book called *When Doubt, Mumble*. Have you all read that? Boren's book? No? I am sure you all have. I watch the debates often. I am not going to mumble, so that is the first thing.

The Chair: Maybe we have read it without knowing it.

Mr Pasternak: He wrote the book watching you people doing it, so it was easy to write, I guess.

I am at a slight disadvantage, and the reason I am disadvantaged is that I have spent the past 30 years consulting to various government groups. I guess I have consulted to about 50 branches of government at this stage: municipal, provincial and federal—I think five provinces about six ministries federally and so on. In addition, I have taught about 30,000 people in various workshops, seminars and lectures.

I guess I have sort of an unique view of the problem. But part of the problem is that so do 10,000 other Ontarians have a unique view from their experiences. Part of the problem is that you are not going to be talking to those 10,000 people and, as I will get to in a second, that is really the problem that we are faced with. It is as simple as that.

If you are going to solve something, you had better define the problem correctly. I am sure you know that. You have hired management consultants and they come and they tell you these things, so this is not new. So what is the problem? What is the problem we have at hand here? It is not just a French-English problem. If that were the case how could the Swiss survive with four official languages? So it is not French and English. It is not just regional economic disparity. How are they getting a common European market together if that was the cause of problems? They are getting along fantastically over there.

In my opinion, the real problem is you people and the Constitution. Because what you people—and I mean you people in the Ontario government and the federal government and the BC government and the municipal governments—do is deny me and the other 90% of Canadians a real say in approving or disapproving the Constitution of the country, the laws of the country, the legislation of the country. There is the problem.

You people are the ones who are going to have to change it. I am not going to take a gun and start attacking Queen's Park or the Parliament buildings. Canadians are not like that. We like attacking weak people like the Mohawks and things like that. You people are going to have to cause the change; it is your responsibility.

2200

The majority of Canadians were opposed to going into the Gulf war, not really the Gulf war, the Iraq-Kuwait conflict. Mulroney came on television and said: "I don't care what Canadians want. I know what's right." And w

can go through the GST—I am sure you have read the whole long list of things that most Canadians oppose yet they are there.

Of course, you say, "Well, we have a democracy." Yes, the Soviet Union calls its government a people's democracy, South Africa calls its form of government a democracy, so do not use that word.

George Woodcock, a good English-stock Canadian historian who teaches at the University of British Columbia wrote an essay recently. He calls the Canadian system 20-year fascism, and unless there is a minority government that is what it is. We all know that. So there is the problem and the question is, what is the solution? In all of 20 minutes or whatever I have left—notice it has taken 20 years to figure out its Constitution and I am supposed to come in in five minutes and give you the solution and so on.

The problem is, of course, that we have to change this pound. How do we give Canadians the method of approving or disapproving the Constitution, legislation, laws, whatever there is to approve or disapprove? For want of a better example, let's pick a country that has had 500 years of doing it, the Swiss. I am not suggesting we take the Swiss Constitution and try to apply it, but I am not going to show you people, because you should know all this stuff. I would like the cameras—I am really not talking to you people; I am talking to the people at home. Here is the Canadian. The average citizen hears the process whereby we can approve or disapprove of the Constitution, of the laws, legislation, whatever—of course there is none. Every five years for 30 seconds you have that little democracy, whereas the Swiss have eight or nine checkpoints to change the law.

So what I suggest is that we take in the 50,000-100,000 solution. What does that mean? In Switzerland if 50,000 people oppose the existing Constitution, existing legislation, you have to have a referendum. It is as simple as that. Lots of issues are raised behind people and yes, sure, they would be debated and yes, we should vote on it and decide. On the other hand, 100,000 people bring legislation, constitutional change to the country, and we may do it the way the Swiss do or not.

If it comes to the Parliament, so to speak, in Switzerland, in three weeks it has to be debated. If it is not debated, that becomes law; that becomes Constitution; that is it. So they have to debate it. You cannot put it on a shelf for five years, like we see with all kinds of legislation. It is either debated or put to the vote of the people. So there is a solution and I think we had better do it quick.

The Japanese have just begun. If you think our economy is in bad shape now and the Japanese are ahead of us now, wait for five years. The Japanese are not successful because they all bow in the morning and walk around in little caps. They are successful because they are 50 light years ahead of the Swiss.

There is a book that you should all read written by Shumpei Kumon, which will tell you all about it and what it is. It is now the wisdom game, so if you do not make these changes it is going to happen without you. It is going to take a longer period.

JOHN DOWLING

The Chair: Could I call John Dowling. It has been pointed out to me that I also omitted to call Isabella O'Shea, and I call her and then we will conclude at that point.

Mr Dowling: I represent the National Farmers' Union. I happen to be the elected co-ordinator for Ontario. Recognizing that you have reached the end of the day and are all very tired and so on, I have to offer you a little bit of a remark that came to me earlier in the evening. Having heard many of the presentations, it occurred to me that the solution was already in the form of these transponders that we have here. They go in in French and come out in English and vice-versa. Every Canadian should have one. Perhaps with technology we can do this and perhaps we will solve some of our problems.

I farm nearby here, just to fill you in a little bit. I farm about 20 minutes from here, about 10 miles, on an island. But I served during the Second World War with a regiment from western Canada and I learned what a leper was: an eastern Canadian put in a western regiment. When I got overseas I discovered that we were issued Canadian badges and at that point we were all contemporaries. We were Canadians. We were no longer eastern or western.

This is one of our major problems in the country. In the cemeteries in France and Holland there is no segregation; we are all Canadians. The people who are lying in those graves and fought beside me came from Quebec, came from Acadia, and came from western Canada. I am greatly concerned with some of the things I have heard tonight, but I am not here to go any farther into that.

I will just say to you that the problems of agriculture are major in this country and it is that I would like to address and say to you that our organization was formed by an act of Parliament in 1970. This act of Parliament incorporated the National Farmers' Union, formally amalgamated into a single organization from four provincial autonomous farm unions functioning in the provinces of British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Of primary consideration, the desire of farm union members to organize a direct membership, non-partisan, national farm policy-making body was recognition of the fact that many problems confronting farmers could only be adequately addressed through national effort and government policy initiatives.

This logic has further extended to agree on the principle that farmers from across Canada should meet as farmers in an annual convention to agree upon national policy issues and also to establish, to harmonize the basic policy guidelines and principles for the policies of provincial jurisdiction and initiatives. Provincial policy issues are further refined at annual meetings of members in each region in which we have membership.

2210

The National Farmers' Union is strongly of the view that in order to provide national perspective and equality in farm programs strong federal policy initiatives are needed. We are concerned that increasing federal farm policies are being eroded and blurred and result in growing disparity between provinces in the availability to farmers of programs

to further stabilize farm production and income. The constitutional accord may serve to further aggravate this situation.

Canada was described by our founding fathers as a land from sea to sea. It is the land we wish to address here. Exploitation of our resources began in the very moment of discovery. Exploitation of the custodians of the land, who were the native people, was also carried out. The native people's strong ties to the land are the farmers' strong ties to the land. Native people and farmers have their same ties in solidarity with the land. Both of us are being denied a voice in our national government's decisions. The Conservative government is ruling by ministerial decision-making and this will inevitably lead to an eroded agricultural policy, where weaker provinces will suffer.

Like the segments of the economy, toploading of agricultural programs lead to farmers in one particular province competing with another. This drift to decentralization of responsibility on agriculture is leading us into a balkanization of our farm policy in our country. The weakening of our federal responsibilities for agriculture is of great concern to farmers. Marketing of farm products is a matter for provincial jurisdictions. Programs of a federal nature require participation by provinces compatible with national policies.

The loss of this glue between the province and the federal government would seriously impede national farm product marketing agencies and contribute still further to the balkanization of farm programs, resulting in national disparities in regions.

The Chair: Mr Dowling, perhaps you could sum up please?

Mr Dowling: The National Farmers' Union is attempting to develop national farm policies and programs capable of delivering equity and justice to all farmers. A strong central government is imperative to achieve this objective. In order to retain economic viability and in order to maintain sovereignty in food our national government has to include in its agenda a strong policy that will protect the land and its people, both native and agricultural.

Past attitudes to exploitation of the land have to be set aside in favour of policies that ensure a socially aware, economically viable Canada for our unborn generations of Canadians.

ISABELLA O'SHEA

The Chair: I will call Isabella O'Shea, and I am getting an indication from the members that the committee prefers to continue and try to finish the list, so I will keep going. There are, I think, three or four other speakers after Mrs O'Shea. Following Mrs O'Shea I will call David Dossett. Go ahead, madam.

Mrs O'Shea: Thank you for including me. I was told early in the evening that I would be on and it was a bit of a disappointment when I thought I was not going to be.

There is so much talk of change, and while that is useful and change is inevitable, we must remember also where we came from to the present. It is rather unusual to tear down a domicile in order to improve it. Customarily, one builds on the positive while trying to minimize the negative aspects. I have not had the time or the energy or

the expertise to deal with how to go about the resolution these matters in Canada, but I did want to have my two cents' worth.

Even in ancient writings we find that some of our sociology texts tell us that the behaviour of foreign people were fully noted. It is easy to pinpoint the differences in languages and food and social customs, while the fundamental similarities are often overlooked. We forget sometimes that within each group there is a full range of differences and similarities. These must be respected and built upon. Those coming to Canada must learn something of the groups already here and respect their prior claims. The Europeans should have and now must come to satisfactory and just terms with the aboriginal people.

The two language groups, French and English, which were the first non-American languages imposed on the northern part of what is now called North America, should in turn seek to learn about and therefore appreciate the so-called newcomers. We have been in the world audience viewing the coming together of a large part of the continent of Europe, but as someone who had an opportunity to live and work on that continent, I can never imagine the local customs and languages being submerged, let alone lost. Multiculturalism has often seemed to divide our people into "them" and "us" when it should be the means of better knowledge and understanding of and for one and all. Heritage day, for example, could really be a celebration. The very things that probably brought us together may also tear us apart if we allow it.

Just a personal experience: In Kapuskasing, I worked there many years ago and I can remember girls being fired—I am not using the word "girls" in a derogatory sense—young women being fired or being threatened with being fired by Bell Canada if they spoke French to a French-speaking customer. Some change now when we have the chief executive officer being a French-speaking person. I do not imagine that happens any more.

Dissatisfaction with life in general, or at least with those respective governments wanted our forefathers or foremothers to live in the old countries or in the hope of a better life for them and for their children, brought most of even the first two European groups to these northern shores. Now our very emphasis on some of these trends to drive us apart and makes us seem to be more like the civilizations our ancestors left.

A very old observation comes to us that the degree of civilization of any culture is judged by the way in which the weakest and most vulnerable of its members are protected. Of course in a market society these would be considered the least productive and therefore the most expendable. Therefore, I hope that Ontario will always be in the forefront regarding the wellbeing of its residents as well as all the other citizens and would-be citizens of Canada through medicare and all the necessary programs for human health and happiness.

Personally, I also hope that this province would find it possible to augment the counselling and the total support for pregnant women so that the unique little humans that so generously carry for our civilization are able to be born and grow up to enjoy this wonderful country. I hope also

at our provincial representatives would so counsel the her partners in Canada.

This present federal government seems much more interested in linking us with our southern neighbours than truly trying to keep the country together from east to west. Physically Canada needs the trains, the planes, national communication systems and excellent highways and in east to west as well as a northerly direction to help to bind this country together.

We also need more interchanges on various levels involving all the provinces. The young people have a right to the Canada they want. Many of us here tonight are almost finished with an earthly sojourn. It is up to us, the so-called seniors, to show them in practice the virtues we so goodly preach about, for example, neighbourliness. We will know that it is much easier to live technically with the neighbour that we do not have to live with or to be technically a neighbour to those we do not have to live with than those we have to be close to.

I was delighted to hear the historian—I did not get his name—who spoke this evening about the three histories. That would be a minimum. I would maintain that each province has a collection of histories written with some definite bias. I wrote to a prime minister years ago, in 1967 in fact, suggesting that the council of education ministers use some of its time and money to prepare a common core history, with copies of all the pertinent documents, with all their stars and warts, being made available at the appropriate ages to all the students of Canada. After all, they are our future.

220

The Chair: Would you sum up please, ma'am?

Mrs O'Shea: Okay. I, for one, pray that we are able to resolve our differences and build on the positive and stay together. I listened intently this morning to Mr Gzowski interviewing Mr Bourassa and the very latest statistics quoted by them stated that a slight majority of the people in Quebec who were polled still favoured federalism. Those who do not have an honest record—I am paraphrasing loosely—of what went before are likely to repeat their mistakes.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for allowing me to express my concern. Some may be very repetitious, but thanks again and every best wish with your hearings and your report. Thanks again.

The Chair: Thank you, ma'am.

DAVID DOSSETT

The Chair: David Dossett and, next, David Wren.

Mr Dossett: Thank you, Mr Chairman. When I was a young boy, I tended to look down on minorities, especially francophones. I did not want French on my cereal boxes or on my soup labels. But when I got a little older I was sent to Quebec to learn French in French exchange programs. I guess that is what our friends in the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada would call enforced bilingualism. These programs were sponsored by the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews and the federal government.

I also studied at Laval for a year and I worked for a summer in an Ontario-Quebec exchange program in the provincial government in Quebec City. I learned there that there is a different point of view than what I was used to here in Ontario, a different point of view but a valid one none the less.

I became aware of a group of people in a region of North America who were struggling to maintain their language and their culture against incredible odds. I became aware of a group in this province and other regions of the country who were struggling to preserve their language against oppressive language laws which we were imposing upon them in Ontario and in Manitoba, among other places.

When I came back from Quebec after all of this, I realized that I had changed in noticing that Ontario had not changed. Its attitudes have not changed. For example, groups like APEC started to spring up to protect English-language rights. Mr Chairman, do not deceive yourself. Look at their platform very carefully. You will see that their doctrine is not one of equality but one of superiority. I have had the pleasure of speaking with some of the leadership of APEC on a personal basis and in talking to them, they refer to francophones as either frogs or pepsis, so when you listen to what they say, bear in mind that this is behind what they say. These are the kind of ways they view others in the province and in the country.

These are some of the suggestions I think that I would like to bring forward to you:

Changes to the Constitution and amending formulas, etc, are superficial unless we work towards changing attitudes in this province. We witnessed this evening and I have witnessed other evenings, I have read in the paper, prime examples of intolerance. We have seen it here from the platform and from the audience earlier. We know that francophones have been told to go home if they have a French accent or if they speak in French. We have seen it on the streets; we have heard about it everywhere; I have seen it.

Another thing I think we have to do here in Ontario is destroy some of the myths and paranoia that are around. Number one, there is a myth going around—and I think one of the members here is aware of this. It was an all-candidates meeting during the last election. Somebody had posed a question and it went something like this: "Are you aware, Mr Representative, that the Ontario Provincial Police cars are changing colour from black to blue, just like the Quebec Provincial Police? What do you have to say about that?" The implication is that Quebec is on an invasion of the rest of Canada and that, first, they take over the OPP, then they change the colours and then they put their own people in place of our OPP officers.

There is another thing going around Kingston, another interesting rumour. All the labels in Loblaw's were turned around so the French side was showing on one aisle. This is scary. They are coming. They are around the corner.

You think that is funny and I think that is funny, but the people at that one meeting—I know you will recall, sir—were very serious about these rumours.

Also, there is a rumour that there is a French plot and another example of it is the proliferation of French-language stations on TV and on radio the French-language radio stations are stronger. That is insidious, is it not? I mean, we have to address these. We have to bring these fears in the open and deal with them so that we discuss them and try to resolve them.

Now, there is another myth. If you learn a second language, your first language will suffer. We have all heard that. My son is learning a second language. He started last year and he is doing fine. You would not know that he is learning a second language. You would think he is a perfectly normal anglophone, but he is not. He is bilingual. He has been going to a French day care, he is now going to a French school and he is fine. He is just as bright as any other kid, and I know approximately 24 other kids who are the same way. They pick up French faster than they pick up a cold. That is what we should be doing in this province. We should be encouraging that, not discouraging it. We should be putting more money into that.

Interjection: Whose money?

Mr Dossett: The other thing is to have respect for people when they are talking. I listened to everybody else.

The Chair: Sorry, go ahead, Mr Dossett, although we do need to conclude it, so sum up as well.

Mr Dossett: Okay, have respect for other people, have respect for other opinions and listen. If we listen in the country, we can resolve our problems, but we have to be willing to listen and be prepared to at least open our ears. It does not mean we have to accept everything, but at least we can listen.

So I think we should expand bilingual education and make sure that more people in the province enrol their children in bilingual education and encourage diversity and consider it an asset and not a problem to be overcome or suppressed, because surely, if we have people who can speak many languages in this country, it is a tremendous resource that we can use to sell our products abroad. It would be an advantage that countries like the United States would not have.

In conclusion, I hope that we as Canadians do not stand in the way of our development by being restrictive and restricting language, but we should be open and promote our language differences. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

DAVID WREN

The Chair: David Wren, and then the final speaker will be Sheila Martin. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Wren: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, for giving me the opportunity to speak to you this evening regarding the perspective from the deaf community. You have to forgive me, I am a little nervous. I think I would like to state that we were very happy when Meech Lake accord was defeated, went to its death. There was a smile on every one of our faces, because there were numerous issues that were addressed that were of concern to us. An example would be the native issues, issues for women and

for disabled people and their rights as well. Tonight I am going to be focusing more on the rights of deaf people.

People ask me if I am a person from Kingston, Kingstonian. If they ask me if I am an Ontarian, I say no and I am not a Kingstonian. I am a Canadian and that is what my response is when they ask me where I am from.

For many, many years the news on television has had closed-captioning regarding Canada, but specifically pertaining to Ontario it has been minimal. We do not have any local news stations closed-captioned. We do not have access to the events in my own home community here in Kingston. I would like to know what is going at city hall. I want to know what the issues are, people's opinions, but we do not have access to it because they are not captioned. Finally, Queen's Park now has its coverage closed-captioned, so we have access there, but again, our access with closed-captioning is limited.

2230

Another example would be at Queen's Park, and this discussion here, the closed-captioning, it is not available continuously. Deaf people are very much interested in what people's opinions are. So the issue that people were talking about between French and English, and it seems to be more of communication and that is where the problems occur.

So deaf people are very tolerant, and that is a term that has been used. We are tolerant, more so with our language. We do have regional dialects within our language and we do have a language which is termed ASL, which is an acronym for American sign language, whereas we have the equivalent for the francophone deaf people, LSQ, which is sign language—I am not sure of the total term for it, but it is the sign language for francophone deaf people. Then we also have maritime sign language. Deaf people are united and we are able to communicate through a visual form, so we are tolerant. We are very, very tolerant people.

So I think and I hope that we will see Quebec remain in Canada and become part of the Confederation. We do not and I personally do not want to see Quebec leave. This year in Kingston we will be hosting a slow-pitch baseball tournament which is a national event and we will have representation from each province in Canada, as well as francophone deaf people from Quebec. We will have people communicating in LSQ, as well as bringing in LSC interpreters. We are not opposed to the francophone deaf community. They are part of our family. We see no difference between us.

I guess that is all I wanted to say. Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Wren. Could I call the Sheila Martin? She is not here?

Okay then, that concludes our speakers for the evening and it concludes our hearings here in Kingston. We want to thank all those people who participated with us this evening and this afternoon. It certainly has added to the views that we heard expressed in the other locations. Our hearings continue tomorrow from Peterborough and we invite you to continue following our proceedings through the parliamentary network if you are so interested.

Thank you very much. Good evening. We are recessed.

The committee adjourned at 2235.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 26 February 1991

Task Force on Canadian Federalism	C-767
Tobowk Council of Akwesasne	C-770
Cornwall and District Multicultural Council	C-773
Coalition des Organismes Francophones de Stormont, Dundas et Glengarry	C-775
Richard Hickerson	C-782
Shirley Armstrong	C-784
Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry Legal Clinic	C-784
Donald Bergeron	C-785
Ken Davies	C-786
Rue Guindon	C-788
Cornwall Collegiate and Vocational Institute	C-790
Afternoon sitting	C-792
Chinese Canadians of Kingston and District	C-792
Centre Frontenac	C-794
Optimist Club, Club Optimiste	C-795
St Joseph's School	C-796
First Nations Technical Institute	C-798
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario des Mille-Îles	C-800
Helen Cooper	C-802
Kingston Collegiate and Vocational Institute	C-804
Raymond Bouchard	C-808
Midge Rouse	C-810
Evening sitting	C-812
L. W. Ormerod	C-812
Vince Maloney	C-814
Peter Campbell	C-814
L. H. Storey	C-816
James Ilett	C-817
Neil Fraser	C-818
Arthur Keppel-Jones, Hugh G. Thorburn	C-819
Neil Dukas	C-820
Raymond Roberts	C-821
Aubrey Garrett	C-822
Maria Heissler	C-823
David Switzer	C-824
Bruce Vowles	C-824
Ann Bordeau	C-825
Rason Balgopal	C-826
Alex Craig	C-827
Harry Pasternak	C-828
John Dowling	C-829
Sabella O'Shea	C-830
David Dossett	C-831
David Wren	C-832
Adjournment	C-832

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)

Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Wininger, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

Stockwell, Chris (Etobicoke West PC) for Mr Eves

Wilson, Gary (Kingston and The Islands NDP) for Ms Harrington

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis

Clerk pro tem: Brown, Harold

Staff:

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

20N
2
90
2

Comm. 13
Publication



C-18 1991

C-18 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 27 February 1991

select committee on
Ontario in Confederation



Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 27 février 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 27 February 1991

The committee met at 1541 in the city hall, Peterborough.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. Good afternoon. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. I would like to welcome, on behalf of the committee, all of the members of the public who are here with us in Peterborough this afternoon. We are continuing our hearings across the province, to give the people of the province an opportunity to talk to us as a committee of the Legislature of Ontario on their wishes and aspirations for the future of the province and the country, and we appreciate the opportunity to be able to be here in Peterborough this afternoon and this evening.

First of all, I want to apologize for being late in starting, partly due to the committee members being late getting here from Kingston. That is where we were meeting earlier today. As people know, the proceedings are being televised over the parliamentary network, and we had some delays because of technical problems with that. In any event, we are beginning and we will ensure that all of the people who are on our list to speak will get heard. We will extend the time accordingly to make sure that happens.

I want to introduce the members of the committee. This is a committee made up of representatives of the three political parties. From the NDP caucus, in addition to myself we have Gary Wilson, Gilles Bisson, the Vice-Chair—we will be joining us shortly—Marilyn Churley, Gary Malkowski, Fred Wilson and David Winninger. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, who will also be joining us shortly, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative caucus, Charles Harnick and Chris Stockwell.

It has been a long day and a long week. This is the fourth week of our hearings, so we are getting a little tired. I think it is fair to say that, but we are none the less very interested and will be quite interested in the views of the people in this area of the province.

I think members of the committee have been told that the microphones here are voice-activated. I gather that some of the conversations we were having were being heard in the audience, which is fine. I think this is part of the process as well, but just so people realize that.

PETERBOROUGH AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL

The Chair: I would like to call the first group to speak to us from the Peterborough and District Labour Council, Dean Shewring. I point out, as indicated on the schedule available to people, that we have allocated 15 minutes for each group presenting, and we would appreciate if within that presentation you would also allow a little time for us to deal with some questions from the committee.

Mr Shewring: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, brothers and sisters. My name is Dean Shewring. I am the president of the Peterborough and District Labour Council. I have provided copies of my brief plus a supplement with source material for my presentation.

The Peterborough and District Labour Council, representing 44 affiliated locals with over 5,000 trade union members, has been asked to appear before this committee to present its position on the kind of Canada we would like to see in the future.

I, on behalf of the executive council and delegates to the labour council, would like to thank the members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation for giving me this opportunity to appear before you to present our views. We do, however, question the value of such an exercise, given the plethora of committees, commissions and fact-finding bodies currently criss-crossing Canada in search of the elusive soul of our country. Will the findings of this committee end up gathering dust on the same shelves as numerous royal commissions and committees of the past?

In any case, at least organized labour is being asked for its opinions. Labour is usually asked what it thinks after decisions have already been made, and then only as a matter of token concern. In spite of our doubts about this process, there is much to be said regarding the future of Canada and we, as representatives of organized labour in Peterborough and area, will endeavour to contribute positively to this debate.

We, as working people, sometimes despair at the games-playing of politicians, who seem to spend much of their time worrying about how they will appear in the history books instead of getting on with the job of governing this country on behalf of its citizens.

Organized labour has watched political parties, largely representing big business, manipulating the economy of Canada in the interests of the wealthy few at the expense of everyone else. The main technique used by these politicians to disguise their activities and to get themselves re-elected is through the promotion of regional tensions across the country. An obvious example of this is the blaming of Newfoundland for the failure of the Meech Lake accord. It was obvious to everyone that it was the single stand by Elijah Harper which killed the accord, but Mr Harper as a villain was not acceptable to the federal Tory government. They had to insist that Premier Clyde Wells and Newfoundland were the ones to blame. That is how it is done in this country: If your region or province fails at something, blame another region for your problems.

The past two federal governments have very successfully mastered this technique. It has been very easy over the years for politicians to use our country's geographic and linguistic differences to divide and conquer Canadians

again and again. There is, however, a price to be paid for their success, and that price has been paid through Canada being brought to the point of disintegration.

Canada's economy at the federal level is being restructured by the Mulroney government to fit in with its narrow philosophy of: What's good for General Motors, or Argus Corp or the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, etc, is good for the country. We are told that free trade, contracting out, deregulation and privatization are good for Canada. The benefits of these wonderful new ideas, however, have proven to be very elusive for working Canadians.

Free trade with the US has been a disaster for Canada. Many new jobs were supposed to be created under this deal, but only 148,000 jobs have been created during the period of free trade while we have lost about 226,000 jobs in Canada during this same period. The chance that we can be winners in a new deal with both the US and Mexico is even more ludicrous, given that it is impossible for Canadian workers or businesses to compete with wages as low as \$5 a day in Mexico.

The purposes of contracting out, deregulation and privatization are to reduce wage rates, standards of quality and to try to reduce the influence of trade unions, if not to eliminate them entirely. Both unionized and non-unionized workers only make advances when trade unions are strong and able to bargain for good contracts for their members and to lobby good labour legislation for all working Canadians.

The current recession has resulted in the loss of many jobs in the region, which includes the Peterborough area. The unemployment rate is up to 15.2%, according to the most recent figures. The recent massive rise in the cost of living can be directly linked to the introduction of the goods and services tax.

Big business, which can move to any place in this country where it can get the best deal, or can now move out of the country so much easier under free trade, has certainly gained a great deal from virtually every economic incentive introduced by the federal government. You do not hear many complaints from that quarter, except perhaps how Canada's social safety net must be cut to reduce the national debt, the deficit being that wonderful all-purpose excuse to do nothing when something clearly has to be done.

It is our economy which holds us together. It contains all of those activities of work, culture and communications which give us the common framework upon which the country is structured. Public works such as the building of railroads and other forms of mass transportation, social programs such as medicare and national communications such as the CBC are all part of this framework, and all are under attack by this government. The failure of recent initiatives by the federal government to promote the unity of Canada corresponds with its failure to promote an economic blueprint to contribute to the wellbeing of working people, the majority of Canadians.

There is no better example to give regarding the current federal government's failure to provide unity to this country than to state the example of what has happened to Canada Post. In January 1986, there were 5,955 rural and urban post offices in Canada. By mid-1990, 22 urban post

offices and over 700 rural post offices had been closed. Canada Post plans to shut down its entire network of public post offices—all 5,221 rural post offices and all 734 city and town post offices—by 1996. Just as an aside, I should point out that I expect Canada Post to fail at this goal because it is so incompetent at running the post office that even in dismantling it, it is showing its incompetence.

The rural post offices in this country and many of the urban post offices represent the only—and we mean the only—federal presence across much of Canada. When these offices are replaced by privatized postal outlets, there is no obligation to provide the full range of federal government materials or services which most Canadians should expect as a matter of course. It may seem a small point, but privatized postal outlets are under no obligation to fly the Canadian flag. There are no provisions made for other federal government operations to be provided at privatized postal outlets. The presence of the federal government will soon disappear entirely from much of rural Canada. Who is to blame for this state of affairs?

1550

To quote the current president of Canada Post, Donald Lander, the program of privatization is "a government plan." How can you expect a country to remain united when the government itself is in the process of dismantling major areas of its structure which could be used in a positive way to keep Canada together?

There is one other important question which must be asked. What kind of future can Canada possibly have if our foreign policy is seen by most Canadians as being dictated by the government of the United States? Canada built a reputation as a responsible peacemaking power through its efforts in the United Nations. Canada has been very well regarded over the years as a country that could be relied on to make positive attempts to resolve international disputes and, on occasion, to take a different stand from the US on key issues when warranted.

Under the current federal government, Canada is being seen as lap-dog for US interests and, coupled with a toadyish domestic economic policy, has brought our nation increasingly into international disrepute. How can we have a successful foreign policy if it is perceived as Brian Mulroney phoning George Bush to find out what it is?

Canada is in for a difficult time over the next few years. Our domestic economy is the key to our future, but it is now in the hands of an incompetent and corrupt federal government. Therefore, the first order of business for organized labour is to employ all means possible to remove this government from office. The Canadian Labour Congress in conjunction with the provincial federations of labour and the labour councils, is currently implementing a program to achieve that goal.

There will be, for example, a demonstration against the economic policies of the Mulroney government at Queen Park in Toronto on Saturday 16 March. The Peterborough and District Labour Council will be providing a bus full of members from our affiliated locals, which will be leaving this morning from the Canadian General Electric, Monaghan Road parking lot about 8 am. All interested members of the public are invited to join us at this demonstration.

The Canadian Labour Congress, working with the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, provided an alternative budget to the one presented by Finance Minister Michael Wilson. This alternative budget called for, among other things, the scrapping of the goods and services tax; a halt to all privatization and deregulation; a restoration of funding to Via Rail, the CBC, and for research and development; a tax increase for corporations and the wealthy; investment in public works, education and the environment; the introduction of a national non-profit child care system; withdrawal of cuts to federal transfer payments; a lowering of interest rates; and provision of more social and non-profit housing.

In addition, a recent conference on job loss sponsored by the Ontario Federation of Labour has called on the Canadian Labour Congress to organize a one-day work stoppage during 1991 as part of the CLC's fight-back campaign.

These and other measures to be announced in the near future will be used to try to force the current federal government to call an early election. It is important that the Mulroney government be removed from office as soon as possible to prevent it doing further irreparable damage to our Canadian federation.

Canada needs a government with direct involvement and input from the labour movement and workers in general. There is to be any hope of a positive future for Canada. Why? For one thing, Canadian workers cannot easily pack up and leave the country when the economic situation gets tough, unlike certain very mobile big business interests. Workers have a stake in the success of Canada as an independent nation. We cannot expect to attain our goals of peace, security and economic wellbeing if Canada is not united and secure from sea to sea.

The questions of native land claims, of Quebec's place in Confederation and of our relationships with other governments, both domestic and foreign, could all be satisfactorily dealt with if working people had a more direct voice in government. The events of the last six years demonstrate this very well.

The future of Canada looks rather bleak at the moment, but we have gotten through worse in the past. Through all sections of society working together we can provide a future for our children and grandchildren in a united and prosperous Canada. Thank you.

Mr G. Wilson: As the past president of the Kingston and District Labour Council, I am particularly pleased to welcome you to this forum. You certainly provide a lot of solid data about why the Mulroney government represents such a threat, and I think you would agree that it represents a threat to all of Canada.

My question concerns the relation between organized labour in Quebec and organized labour in the rest of the country. From your experience, I would like to ask you whether you think the relation is as strong as it could be and, if not, how it could be fostered so that there is more contact, because presumably the policies of the Mulroney government are disastrous for labour in Quebec as well.

Mr Shewring: One good thing about it is the fact that the Canadian Labour Congress is represented in Quebec

through the Quebec Federation of Labour, so there is regular contact every two years at the conventions as well as ongoing programs of the CLC which occur. The labour councils, as you should know from direct experience, are directly chartered by the Canadian Labour Congress, so we can get all sorts of information from the labour movement in Quebec and find out more about what is going on. There is at least a major line of communications with labour in Quebec, although, as you also well know, there are other labour confederations in Quebec which are not affiliated with the CLC. But on an ongoing basis, particularly at the CLC conventions, a lot of these questions are dealt with, and hopefully, if the atmosphere gets a little better, then perhaps we can foster a better relationship across the boundaries.

In fact, I recall watching this committee hearing a couple of days ago, and I heard a gentleman, I believe from Quebec, express the position that it would be a good idea to have more ordinary citizens going to and from Quebec to Ontario and obviously other parts of the country as well to try to communicate more directly, because that is one of the major problems we have, the fact that the politicians with their own interests—their own obvious interests, from my point of view and I think from a lot of people's point of view—have been mainly involved with the process of the disintegration of Canada. I know it would be a lot better if ordinary citizens, working Canadians, had a chance to talk to each other, and that is an idea perhaps you might consider in your report.

Mr G. Wilson: Could I just have a brief supplement?

The Chair: I am sorry, we are going to carry on.

1600

Mr Harnick: Sir, you made mention of the visibility of the central government, and your reference was the post office.

Mr Shewring: Yes. I work there.

Mr Harnick: That the federal or central government should be visible. We have heard a lot from different people, some who believe that with constitutional amendment the central government should be less visible and should decentralize, the provinces should become stronger, and we have also heard the opposite. In terms of labour's position, does labour believe in a decentralized federal government or does it believe that we should have, after any amendments to the Constitution are made, a stronger federal government?

Mr Shewring: It is difficult for me to speak on behalf of all organized labour on this particular issue, but I know the question of the visibility of the federal government is important, and also the question that the federal government should be living up to its responsibilities. It should not be getting out of everything the way it has been doing.

I do not have information prepared to state exactly what particular areas it should be in or not in, but, for example, national transportation is very important, national communications are very important. If those things are not in the hands of and controlled by the federal government, then we are in real serious trouble. We are in trouble now, but we would be in worse trouble.

But when you think about the ones I mentioned in my brief, communications, transportation, those areas—and the post office is part of communications—the flag has to be shown across the country. The way to do it is in those areas where the federal government is responsible, most importantly responsible.

The economic leverage of this country has to be at least shared with the provinces. We understand that the provinces have almost all the economic responsibilities pretty much right now, with the exception of, say, trade and several other areas, but there should be a sharing of those areas where there is a federal government interest.

I know it is hard to explain in that way, but as long as the major segments of transportation and communications are in the hands of the federal government, administered by it and definitely something which it knows it is responsible for and is not going to try to slough off on someone else, then that, I think, is the most important thing.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Shewring. We have to carry on.

UNITED CITIZENS' ORGANIZATION

The Chair: I call next Ray Peters from the United Citizens' Organization.

Mr Peters: I have given sufficient copies to the clerk of our presentation of three pages. I hope all committee members have a copy of it.

My name is Ray Peters and I am president of the United Citizens' Organization of Peterborough and district. I will explain very briefly a few aspects of our organization. Our organization is made up mainly of low-income citizens but not exclusively so. Included as one of the aims in our constitution is that we will work unitedly for the betterment of all the people in our country. Our preamble provides that we "unite citizens regardless of age, sex, race, nationality, creed, political beliefs or affiliations." Oh, what a wonderful thing it would be if our country would subscribe to this basic belief and put into practice these great principles, and put our shoulder to the wheel for the betterment of our citizens. Maybe all of us would learn how to keep our country together if all the well-meaning people in our country embarked on a crusade for a united Canada.

The question is raised: Do we pay too much attention to the things that divide us and too little to what we have in common? I think we do. I think we have allowed extremists to be the loudmouths in our country who attempt to monopolize the use of the media in all its forms, whether it is letters to the editor or whatever. It is high time the silent majority in this country spoke up loudly and clearly that we are not going to allow this country to be balkanized and destroyed, nor are we going to allow highly prejudiced people to destroy our unity.

I am not trying to hide the fact many people hold genuine concerns, grievances and complaints and that we have to provide social justice to our people. Of course we must address these concerns and must take corrective actions, but we have to do it within the framework of keeping our country together.

Our organization will be mainly talking about social and economic issues because the effects of those policies

are the ones that low-income citizens experience every day. These policies affect citizens whether they are in Quebec, Ontario, in our native communities, or any of our provinces or the Yukon or Northwest Territories. Most of the people of the world would give their eye-teeth to live in a country with the potential of Canada. Unfortunately, often seems we are wasting our opportunities.

Our country was established by many people who realized the necessity of our east-west economic ties, and these ranged from people such as Sir John A. Macdonald to our cross-continental trains and highways, to the CBC. However, the east-west economic ties that have been a historic feature of the Canadian economy are being replaced by stronger north-south links.

Premier Bob Rae said, "This is the time for politicians to rise above partisan interests." Former Premier David Peterson said, "I believe in Canada not only as an economic and political unit, but as the best expression of the type of caring and compassionate society that has served Canadians well for the past 123 years." We have proved that Canadians really care about less wealthy provinces by equalization payments, and this principle is now contained in the Canadian Constitution.

However, our native people suffer from wilful neglect. Fully 40% of their families must share their dwelling with another family. Half of all their housing has unsafe water and inadequate sewage disposal. The death rate for status Indians age 22 to 44 is four times the national average. The rate of violent deaths is also four times the national average. Infant mortality, suicide rates and the rate of admission to hospitals are a shameful page in our history.

Is it unreasonable for a Canadian worker in this rich country of ours to have the opportunity for a job and training when it is required? I think it is not unreasonable, and when we talk of over a million or a million and a half people being unemployed, then we are not providing the social justice which is required. If we want our citizens to be united, we must give them a stake in our country. When we do not do so, we are fanning the flames of separatism and the absorption of our country by the United States.

When we have consumer and business bankruptcies which jumped 69% in January 1991 to 5,991, the highest ever recorded in that month in our country, we are talking about very serious problems. The greatest tragedies in the scenario are probably young people who bought homes with big mortgages and now are having their small businesses destroyed, with all that means in terms of disruption of family and business life.

Our Canadian dollar has been priced too high, partially through high interest rates, which created a made-in-Canada recession. Many of our citizens do a lot of their shopping in the United States, and I think we have to expose the false economy of those efforts and how our treasured social and medical coverage are being undermined.

We had a free trade agreement with the United States and are now talking about including Mexico in that deal. At the same time, the public is being told that wages of 8 cents per hour in Mexico would not be unfair competition for Canadian workers. What hogwash. We need trade, but it needs to be managed trade on a mutually beneficial

sis, where wages and working conditions must meet certain standards.

Social housing is one of the prime requirements in most parts of our country, and we must increase expenditures for that purpose for many years to come because we will not succeed in doing it in one or two years.

One of the abominations in this country is that the federal government has placed a 5% limit on payments to the provinces for welfare allowances, mothers' allowances and disability allowances under the Canada assistance plan in three provinces, which includes Ontario. None of the provinces agreed to it, and the result will be more suffering, greater deprivation and of course premature deaths due to the scourge of poverty.

What a way to rip our country apart. We are going to treat three provinces differently from others. We have to develop a climate in this country where the workers of the nation feel they are not being singled out as they have been for many years in terms of their standards of working and wages, which have suffered tremendously, and the statistics show that over a period of years.

110

Our treasured youth: We have to make our youth feel this is a land of opportunity for them rather than simply providing jobs as hamburger flippers or low-paying service sector jobs. If we really examine the statistics—and this is rarely talked about—we find that our youth are being paid terribly low wages. It is something we did not experience in the past in this country. Very often, the young people got very good wages, but not so today in most instances or a lot of instances.

At the same time, we must change the tax system to close the loopholes whereby many rich individuals and businesses do not pay their fair share of taxes. How can we escape the cynicism of citizens when they know from the length and breadth of this country that the people who can well afford to do it are not paying their proper share?

If we do these things successfully, we will create a majority of stakeholders in this nation who will go out and fight for strong and united Canada in, I predict, every province and every region of our country. If we do not try hard to do so, we will have serious problems for many years to come.

The chronic disease of unemployment for this region we are in, economic region 520, was 15.2% for January 1991; that is including the Peterborough area. These were official figures, which were not disguised by the new three-month moving average which is now being used as well. The committee is probably aware of this new method being utilized by the federal government to state rates of unemployment. The official statistics of Statistics Canada—I have them right here; you see the label: "Statistics Canada"—say the rate of unemployment for this area is 5.2%, but now you get a three-month moving average and, presto, the rate that is released is 12.2%.

The reason we are concerned with unemployment is because the original founders of our organization were mainly unemployed. But we changed our name in 1974 to the United Citizens' Organization, because we represent all kinds of different categories of people, not just unem-

ployed. We were originally founded in 1960 and have been the antipoverty organization in this area ever since.

Our industries in this area have been devastated. General Electric in 1957 had close to 6,000 employees. Outboard Marine, our second-largest industry, at one time had over 2,000 employees and now has only a few dozen. Westclox used to have close to 1,000 employees and now has only a handful. Brinton Carpet closed. Canada Packers closed. Many other industries have had very much lower employment levels. It is true, a certain amount of the slack was taken up, but with low-paid service industries, and our wage levels in terms of comparison with other communities has fallen dramatically. Peterborough used to have one of the highest percentage of industrial employees, with over 50%, but it is probably in the low 20% range now.

Central to a strong Canada is that citizens would have rights which are part of their everyday living. In our 31 years, we have fought cases for thousands and thousands of Peterborough area citizens, in the city and in the rural areas, and in all that time there have only been a few years in which we received funding from the federal government, in the 1970s, for job creation, advocacy and demonstration projects. Since 1979, we have not received one cent from any level of government. Successive provincial governments have told us there was no money to provide funding for our advocacy efforts, and we have never received money from that source. It is high time both the provincial government and the federal government recognized that legitimate, long-term organizations fighting for the rights of low-income citizens should be able to obtain funding with reasonable criteria.

Alberta's Ombudsman in February 1991 stated that there should be a federal Ombudsman's office, and we would add that there needs to be an expansion of the provincial Ombudsman's office to handle complaints against municipalities.

We also think it is high time that our country built or manufactured a much higher degree of the goods in our country, as a job-creation project and to increase our self-sufficiency. We have the potential in Canada, but we need the political will and the individual commitment to regain the prosperity we once knew in our country. If governments provide the leadership, citizens will respond, and if we can create prosperity, real prosperity, in our country, the differences will disappear like melting snow.

A lot of people do not realize that when we talked about fiscal prosperity 25 and 35 years ago, we were talking about real prosperity. We are not talking about the disguised one which we have had in the last few years which ignores the hundreds of thousands of people who are not counted as being unemployed and suffering. But I can tell you for certain that they do exist in our country.

The Chair: I thank you, sir, very much.

ASSOCIATION FRANCO-ONTARIENNE
DES CONSEILS D'ÉCOLES CATHOLIQUES

The Chair: I call next Fleurette Léger, de l'Association franco-ontarienne des conseils d'écoles catholiques.

Mme F. Léger : Monsieur le Président, membres de la commission : Raymond Léger, un représentant du Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques du district de Lakehead m'accompagne pour répondre aux questions.

Je m'appelle Fleurette Léger, présidente sortante de l'Association franco-ontarienne des conseils d'écoles catholiques, ou AFOCEC. Fondée le 4 août 1988, cette association regroupe des conseillers et conseillères scolaires, administrateurs/administratrices, dans 22 sections de langue française de conseils scolaires catholiques. Forte des principes qui orientent l'action de ces conseils membres, l'association a comme but ultime la promotion de l'éducation catholique de langue française en Ontario, et ce à tous les niveaux d'enseignement et pour une clientèle qui s'échelonne du préscolaire à l'âge adulte.

Consciente de l'importance de l'éducation pour la survie et l'épanouissement d'une collectivité de langue minoritaire, l'AFOCEC apprécie l'occasion qui lui est offerte de faire connaître aux membres du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération les aspirations de ses membres mais déplore qu'un débat d'une aussi grande importance se fasse selon un échéancier aussi serré. L'AFOCEC aurait voulu prendre le temps d'approfondir et de répondre à toutes les questions soulevées dans le document de discussion mais, faute de temps, je me vois dans l'obligation de vous présenter une synthèse de notre pensée.

Les francophones de notre association sont grandement inquiets de la situation des Franco-Ontariens face au rejet de l'accord du Lac Meech, au climat qui règne à l'heure actuelle au Québec et aux gestes d'intolérance et d'injustice qui furent posés dans plusieurs municipalités de la province de l'Ontario en 1990. Les événements de la dernière année ont démontré clairement que notre constitution est très inefficace et même désuète. Dans la plupart des cas, il faut l'approbation des Communes, du sénat et d'au moins sept provinces représentant 50% de la population pour changer quelque chose à cette constitution. Dans d'autres cas il faut l'approbation de toutes les provinces, et vous en avez vu le résultat quand moins de 10% de la population du Canada a bloqué l'accord du Lac Meech. Pourquoi ? Deux poids, deux mesures. De plus, les Communes, le sénat et les provinces ont trois ans pour approuver ces changements. Quelle foutaise, puisqu'il y a au moins deux ou trois élections provinciales durant cette période.

La crise constitutionnelle alarmante est loin d'être étrangère à la question linguistique. Le gouvernement ontarien, par le biais de sa politique linguistique, doit promouvoir sa minorité plutôt que de l'opprimer. Plus de huit ans après que les droits à l'enseignement dans la langue minoritaire étaient inscrits dans la Charte, l'Ontario n'assure toujours pas l'accès complet à des établissements de langue française.

1620

Les francophones de l'Ontario ont dû mener des luttes acharnées et déchirantes et ont obtenu des miettes des législateurs provinciaux. Je rappelle à votre mémoire l'infame Règlement 17, les crises scolaires de Sturgeon Falls, de Elliot Lake, de Penetanguishene et j'en passe. Dans plusieurs cas nous avons dû traîner le gouvernement de l'Ontario

devant les tribunaux pour faire respecter nos droits. J mentionne ici les causes les plus récentes, la Loi 30, la Loi 125.

L'AFOCEC est de l'avis que les catholiques francophones ont un droit garanti à un système complet de conseils scolaires catholiques de langue française selon l'article 93 de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867 et les articles 15, 23 et 29 de la Charte des droits et libertés de 1990. Une éducation de qualité égale à celle de la majorité. Nous tenons à souligner que la gestion de l'éducation en langue française ne pourra pas répondre adéquatement aux besoins de la population franco-ontarienne aussi longtemps qu'on n'aura pas la pleine gestion de nos institutions, de la maternelle à la fin de l'université. Le manque de programmes de formation professionnelle collégiale ou universitaire en français constitue un handicap majeur pour les francophones qui veulent se qualifier dans leur langue maternelle. Il est à noter que le Québec, avec une population d'environ 580 000 anglophones, dispose de trois universités et de six cégep de langue anglaise.

Au Nouveau-Brunswick, où la population est de 50% moindre qu'en Ontario, les Acadiens jouissent d'un système complet d'éducation en langue française. Les commissions sur l'unité nationale au cours des années ont toutes reconnu que les deux cultures, française et anglaise, constituaient le fondement même de la Confédération. Les recherches sur les besoins des Franco-Ontariens précisent que dans une province très majoritairement anglophone, les services judiciaires, les services de santé, sociaux et de communication doivent être renforcés afin de contrer l'assimilation galopante. C'est grâce à des investissements personnels des communautés religieuses et campagnes de souscription que les Franco-Ontariens se sont dotés d'infrastructure culturelles, communautaires et économiques. Plusieurs citoyens questionneront les coûts rattachés à ces services mais n'est-ce pas un prix minime à payer pour garder le Canada uni ?

Depuis quelques années nous reconnaissons que les gouvernements ont injecté des fonds pour la promotion du bilinguisme. Il faut aussi souligner la contribution des gouvernements au multiculturalisme. On entend souvent les commentaires face aux coûts pour éduquer les francophones, mais on n'entend à peu près jamais parler de coûts pour éduquer une poignée d'anglophones dans des endroits à forte population francophone. Certains prétendent que les francophones de l'Ontario jouissent de privilèges de faveurs linguistiques. Les Franco-Ontariens ont appris une deuxième langue sans l'aide du gouvernement. Par contre les employés anglophones ont accès à des cours de formation linguistique payés par les contribuables. Au Québec, la minorité anglophone a ses propres hôpitaux et un réseau de services sociaux subventionnés par la province.

Le gouvernement du Canada a donné les sommes suivantes en 1988-89 pour l'enseignement aux groupes minoritaires : pour les francophones hors Québec, 76 million de dollars ; pour les anglophones du Québec, 62 million de dollars. Pour l'étude de l'autre langue, les francophones du Québec, 12 millions de dollars ; les anglophones hors Québec, 65 millions de dollars ; pour les francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick : 800 000 \$; pour les anglophones d

Québec : 1,8 million de dollars, pour un total de 89 millions de dollars pour les francophones et de 128 millions de dollars pour les anglophones.

L'AFOCEC est consciente que les discussions constitutionnelles partout au pays auront un impact profond sur toute la toile de fond du nouveau Canada. Pour les francophones de l'Ontario, le Québec demeure le berceau de la francophonie. L'AFOCEC propose donc au comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération :

Premièrement, que les recommandations des consultations actuelles au Québec servent de base pour trouver un terrain d'entente entre le Canada et le Québec. Ottawa et l'Ontario doivent faire des concessions pour sauvegarder la langue et la culture françaises au Québec et hors Québec.

Deuxièmement, que les législateurs adoptent un processus d'amendements plus équilibré.

Troisièmement, qu'il est essentiel que les structures canadiennes maintiennent leur bilinguisme dans les institutions gouvernementales et que les gouvernements fassent promotion et l'application de cette politique à travers le Canada.

Quatrièmement, qu'une réforme du sénat s'impose et que dans toute nouvelle proposition les législateurs doivent assurer qu'un nombre de sièges soient réservés aux francophones hors Québec.

Cinquièmement, que dans tout amendement à la Loi constitutionnelle de 1982 soient enchâssés les principes suivants : aux droits religieux acquis, le paragraphe 93(1) de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867, les articles 29 et 15 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés de 1982 ; aux droits linguistiques, l'article 23 de la Charte ; le jugement dans l'affaire Mahé le 15 mars 1990 ; aux droits sociaux, la Loi de 1986 sur les services en français ; et aux droits économiques, le financement juste et équitable pour répondre à ces droits.

Nous demandons aux législateurs de l'Ontario d'exercer leur rôle de leadership afin de dénouer l'impasse constitutionnelle qui secoue le Canada en entier et de ne pas perdre de vue les cris des 500 000 citoyens francophones de cette province. Il s'agit du groupe le plus important de francophones hors Québec. Nous avons joué un rôle de premier ordre dans la découverte et le développement de l'Ontario depuis plus de trois siècles. Nous tenons à garder la place qui nous revient dans cette province. Je vous remercie.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. I have basically two short questions from your presentation.

First, and it may be that I just misheard this, we have heard in other presentations of people's feeling that the failure of Meech Lake is read as a rejection of Quebec, and I think I heard you state in your opening statements that you see the rejection of Meech Lake as a rejection of francophone rights in Ontario. Now, I do not know if that is what you have stated, but if it is, I would like to get a further expansion of that point.

The second question I ask is that you made the point dealing with the need for French education and day care centres, all the way up to post-secondary and university education, and you stated that you recognized the cost, but the price is low if we want to maintain the unity of the

country." I am wondering if you can expand upon where the link is between the advancement of francophone rights in this province and the unity of the country vis-à-vis all other provinces.

1630

M. R. Léger : Alors, on a mentionné que, disons la défaite, le rejet de l'accord Meech était aussi une défaite de la francophonie en Ontario. À mon avis, et je dis bien à mon avis personnel, le rejet de l'accord Meech était un rejet de la société distincte au Québec. Les Franco-Ontariens sont une extension de cette société distincte du Québec bien que nous soyons différents des Québécois puisque nous avons évolué dans une société à majorité anglophone dans un système judiciaire autre que celui du Québec, cependant nous avons des droits comme Franco-Ontariens. Si le Canada n'est pas prêt à reconnaître la société distincte du Québec, nous nous posons de sérieuses questions. Est-ce qu'on est prêt à accepter la différence linguistique et culturelle des Franco-Ontariens ?

Donc, c'est dans cet aspect-là que nous nous posons des questions. L'éducation en langue française, nous savons qu'elle a toujours existé en Ontario. Cependant, nous savons très bien qu'elle a été limitée soit au palier élémentaire soit dans des institutions privées en Ontario jusqu'en 1969 quand le gouvernement a bien voulu accorder des écoles secondaires de langue française en Ontario.

Avant ça, il n'était pas question d'écoles secondaires de langue française financées publiquement en Ontario. Présentement, nous avons un seul collège communautaire ou collège d'arts appliqués et de technologie en Ontario ; c'est la Cité collégiale qui dessert l'est de l'Ontario. Or, environ un tiers de la population franco-ontarienne est desservie par un seul collège en Ontario. Nous n'avons aucune université en Ontario qui a le mandat de desservir la population franco-ontarienne. C'est ça l'état de la question en éducation aujourd'hui.

Quant à l'unité, les Franco-Ontariens se sont toujours considérés comme à l'avant-poste de la francophonie en Ontario. Nous avons subi les difficultés d'incompréhension par le passé. Le coût pour nous en Ontario a été une assimilation galopante. Même, on pouvait dire jusqu'à tout récemment que hors du Québec, point de salut pour les francophones. C'est ça vraiment ce que j'ai toujours personnellement dit : quand on quittait le Québec, il n'y avait pas de droits. Heureusement que l'Ontario a donné les écoles secondaires en 1969 et reconnu les écoles élémentaires comme étant des écoles de langue française et non pas des écoles anglaises-françaises, a reconnu le palier collégial en partie en Ontario et surtout en 1986 a donné la Loi sur les services en français. Mais encore là, c'est de façon partielle et c'est peut-être encore trop peu. Merci.

CONSEIL DES ORGANISMES FRANCOPHONES DE LA RÉGION DE DURHAM

M. le Président : Gilles Fournier.

M. Fournier : Bonjour. À la fin de ma présentation, Denis Bédard et moi-même pourrions répondre à vos questions s'il y a lieu.

Je me nomme Gilles Fournier. Je suis membre de l'exécutif du Conseil des organismes francophones de la

région de Durham. Permettez-nous tout d'abord de vous remercier de nous avoir accordé le privilège de vous adresser la parole au nom du Conseil des organismes francophones de la région de Durham.

L'Ontario est sans contredit à la croisée des chemins en ce qui a trait à son avenir personnel au sein de la fédération des provinces connues sous le nom de Canada. C'est pourquoi notre mémoire misera sur le fait que l'Ontario doit accentuer la dualité linguistique nationale qui fait partie de l'identité canadienne. Comme Paul Demers, le chansonnier franco-ontarien l'a si bien dit : «Il faut mettre les accents là où il le faut».

Tout d'abord, situons notre organisme par rapport au vécu des francophones dans la région de Durham et ensuite nous vous ferons part de notre vision de l'Ontario au sein du Canada.

Le Conseil des organismes francophones regroupe 24 organismes dont le centre communautaire l'Amicale, la Fédération des femmes canadienne-françaises de l'Ontario, SOS Femmes, le Club Jeunesse d'hier, le club La clique et le Club canadien-français. Ce conseil dessert une population de 5000 francophones dans la région immédiate de la ville d'Oshawa. Son mandat culturel assure une cohésion et une vitalité d'expression française dans une mer anglophone de plus en plus multiculturelle. À titre d'exemple, l'Amicale, centre communautaire des francophones d'Oshawa, initie et parraine de nombreuses activités francophones afin de promouvoir le fait français dans la région.

Cette présence francophone, en dépit du fait que notre région n'est pas désignée comme étant bilingue, est responsable en grande partie de la croissance francophone qui se manifeste depuis la dernière décennie. L'ouverture d'une deuxième école élémentaire française en plus d'une école secondaire française et la planification d'une troisième école élémentaire témoignent du désir des francophones de se maintenir et même de s'épanouir comme collectivité dans une région qui autrefois se disait exclusivement anglophone. De plus, la Loi 8, adoptée en 1986 et mise en oeuvre en 1989 confirme de façon officielle la dualité linguistique ontarioise «là où le nombre le justifie» et assure aux francophones une viabilité continue de leur culture.

Cette potentialité, reconnue par le gouvernement Peterson et appuyée par les deux autres partis politiques, a servi d'exemple au reste de notre pays que la majorité se doit de s'occuper d'une façon plus définie et plus équitable de sa minorité nationale.

Nous croyons que ce geste concret cherchait à créer un lien, un rapprochement entre les minorités anglaise et française du Québec et de l'Ontario et la façon dont elles étaient perçues par leur gouvernement respectif. Mais, au fait, est-ce que l'Ontario répond à la vision nationale énoncée par les pères de la Confédération en 1867 ?

Le Québec semble avoir compris cette vision. Tout en cherchant à s'épanouir culturellement, il a reconnu et maintenu le fait anglais dans les tribunaux et à la législature. Il a mis en oeuvre une législation spéciale pour garantir l'accès aux services médicaux et sociaux à sa minorité anglaise. Par conséquent, il existe de nombreuses institutions éducatives, médicales et sociales gérées par et pour

les anglophones qui répondent très bien aux besoins de cette minorité.

C'est pour cette raison que l'Ontario se doit de se déclarer officiellement bilingue, non pas pour apaiser les Franco-Québécois, mais pour répondre aux besoins de la population grandissante de francophones et francophiles ontariens. La raison pour laquelle le français doit être choi comme deuxième langue officielle par opposition à l'italien, le portugais ou l'arabe est que la vision originale de notre pays englobe la dualité anglo-française ou, si vous voulez, franco-anglaise. Bien que le pays n'ait vu ses débuts officiels qu'en 1867, n'oublions pas que nos racines canadiennes relèvent des années 1530. En effet, notre héritage historique et culturel est un mélange, que l'on l'admette ou non, l'anglais et du français. Le Franco-Ontarien vit cette réalité depuis longtemps.

C'est pour cette raison que l'Ontario, en ce moment remise en question nationale, doit prendre l'initiative d'agir comme le maillon clé pour unifier les diverses régions du pays.

1640

En guise de conclusion, il est important de se rappeler que le Canada est un pays distinct à cause de cette coexistence entre le français et l'anglais. L'ironie est que cette situation se manifeste d'une façon officielle au Nouveau Brunswick et au Québec où la minorité anglophone a le même droit que la majorité francophone sauf en ce qui a trait à la langue officielle. Ainsi la toile de fond de ce pays qui est le bilinguisme au niveau fédéral et le multiculturalisme, tant fédéral que provincial, n'est qu'une manifestation plus visible de cette tolérance qui découle de notre héritage biculturel.

En terminant, permettez-nous de vous proposer les recommandations suivantes : que l'Ontario se déclare officiellement bilingue et par le fait même qu'il assume le rôle de leadership au sein de la fédération canadienne ; que l'Ontario établisse des mécanismes pour la gestion d'un système éducatif complet pour les francophones, comme c'est le cas depuis 124 ans pour les anglophones, ici ailleurs ; que l'Ontario mette sur pied un réseau de services sociaux francophones, administrés par des francophones incluant hôpitaux, centres communautaires et le reste là où on en fait la demande et non pas là où le nombre le justifie ; que l'Ontario garantisse par statut l'existence d'un ministère pour affaires francophones.

Ces quatre recommandations, honorables membres du comité, serviront à redresser les inégalités historiques qui datent depuis longtemps et permettront une mise au point sur le statut actuel des francophones en Ontario. De plus, elles témoigneront l'initiative sincère de cette province d'assurer un bilinguisme authentique pour tous les francophones et francophiles à venir. Voilà ce qui s'appelle vivre la dualité canadienne.

Mr Bisson: My colleague would like to know your colleague's name.

M. Fournier: Denis Bédard.

Mr G. Wilson: Thanks for a very informative brief, Mr Fournier. You are asking for, especially in the education field, French instruction from child care to university. F

beyond that, there are very few opportunities, probably in this area in particular, for working in French, and I am just wondering what difference that makes to the culture. I guess this would then come down to what it means to be a minority in a larger society.

M. Bédard : D'après votre question, je vous réponds premièrement qu'il y a au-dessus de 700 000 francophiles en Ontario, c'est-à-dire pas des francophones, mais des francophiles qui ont appris le français comme langue seconde. Ces gens-là croissent de plus en plus et à un moment donné il va falloir qu'il y ait un débouché non seulement pour les Franco-Ontariens mais aussi pour les francophiles, et dire tout simplement parce que présentement n'y a pas de demandes dans une région particulière — nous avons cité dans notre mémoire que dans la région de Durham, qui était exclusivement une région anglaise auparavant, maintenant nous avons des écoles d'immersion, nous avons deux écoles primaires, une troisième qu'on lanifie et ensuite une école secondaire. Il va falloir que, avec un système complet d'éducation, et on ne parle même pas de collège — je pense que dans notre mémoire on nous a mentionné tantôt qu'il y a un collège en Ontario pour desservir toute la population francophone et francophile — à un moment donné on demande de plus en plus des gens qui peuvent s'exprimer dans les deux langues officielles. Je pense que vous constatez que, avec la Loi 8, nous avons un permis de conduire où c'est dans les deux langues officielles ; le besoin se fait de plus en plus sentir. Est-ce que nous allons attendre que ce besoin soit tellement grand que l'on est obligé d'acquiescer à la demande de dire : « Bien oui, vous avez raison », ou est-ce qu'on commence à prévoir le besoin chez les francophones et les francophiles ? J'insiste sur le mot francophile parce qu'il y a de plus en plus qui possèdent plus d'une langue. La mentalité américaine d'avoir uniquement une langue et de tout gérer dans le monde, je pense que ça disparaît de plus en plus et vous savez comme moi qu'en Europe il faut parfois et même quatre langues pour pouvoir accéder à des postes. Est-ce que ça répond suffisamment ?

Mr Stockwell : Under your recommendations, you made it very clear. You said where you would supply certain programs, community centres, social services, schooling: in fact, where asked, where they have been requested. It is nothing to do with numbers; it is just where they were requested. Any thoughts on what kind of cost would be incurred, or are you very clear about that? It has not anything to do with numbers; you are directly saying where they have been requested, whether there are 5, 10, 500, 5,000.

M. Fournier : Nous comprenons la difficulté d'offrir certains services à un nombre très restreint de gens. Par contre, il pourrait y exister des services centralisés en différentes régions afin de permettre, par exemple à Moosonee, de se rendre à un endroit où on pourrait se faire servir dans sa propre langue. Dans le moment il existe, par exemple, très peu de centres médicaux où un francophone peut se faire traiter strictement en français. Il en existe à Toronto, il en existe peut-être quelques-uns dans le Nord mais ils sont très difficiles d'accès puis ils sont très difficiles à trouver pour les francophones.

Dans le moment, on aimerait voir des services centralisés en différentes régions afin de ne pas nier le droit aux francophones de se faire servir, n'importe l'endroit où ils demeurent dans cette province.

MEL JACOBS

The Chair: I call next Chief Mel Jacobs from the Curve Lake First Nation.

Mr Jacobs: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, committee members. I do not have a brief for you. Kathleen Taylor was originally supposed to make a presentation today on behalf of the Ontario Native Welfare Administrators Association. She was unable to attend, so she asked if I could come and I thank you for allowing me to be here.

I am not going to speak on behalf of the welfare workers association; I am going to speak on behalf of the Curve Lake First Nation. I am the chief of the first nation. It is a community of 1,250 members locally here. Some 850 of those members live on a reserve of about three square miles. It gives you some idea of the size of the community.

I am not going to speak about grievances or specific things that we have to worry about. I would much rather use this agenda today and this opportunity to speak to you about something that I think not only Indian people but non-Indian people are very much concerned with today, and that is the arrogance, lack of communication, lack of response of members of provincial Parliament when questions are asked or when new processes are put in place.

That is my opening statement with regard to Canada and Indians. However, I think if the Canadian people knew exactly what the Indian agenda was, not only nationally but in the province of Ontario, if they knew what the process was to deal with that agenda and if they knew what the expected results may or may not be at the end of that agenda, we would have a better process of dealing with those things.

Nationally we have claims that are on the table, claims that have been on the table for many, many years. We have pre-Confederation treaties or claims that are not even recognized. There was an arbitrary date established, but there were treaties that dealt with Indians before that. We have treaty grievances nationally. Both governments have talked about self-government initiatives, and in support of those there is discussion about sovereignty. What does sovereignty mean to you? Does it mean sovereignty outside of Confederation? Does it mean some sovereignty within Confederation?

Our constitutional rights were recognized. Constitutional rights were not defined. There is a section of the Constitution that said, "You do have rights." We do not know what they are yet. It seems to me the only time that we really find out what they are is when the Supreme Court of Canada makes a decision such as Sparrow Lake that says there is a right to fish. That is the only time we can find out what constitutional rights are.

I think that leads to the Canadian public generally perceiving that Indian people in Canada are going to continue for ever, endlessly to be a drain on the good social programming of the country. But we do feel that there is an

end in sight if in fact the governments do what they say they are doing.

The Prime Minister of Canada talked about the four pillars, the green plan. He was talking about dealing with the issues of claims in a much quicker and professional manner. Premier Rae made statements soon after his election indicating that if the federal government and the province of Ontario could not get together and collaborate and deal with some of the issues, he would be prepared to move on without the federal government. So we do think we have some agreement from the government.

But I think the Canadian people, the people of Ontario have to understand what that means to them. If the case is there that the provincial governments and the federal governments are willing to deal with all these issues more rapidly—six cases a year federally, more rapidly than two cases a year provincially—then perhaps we should let them know that. The quicker, the better, because the quicker we get some of these claims settled, the quicker we will move towards economic self-reliance.

1650

I mentioned the three-square-mile area that 850 people live on because it does have quite an effect on whether you can become an economically viable place for people to live. If you do not have a good resource base to work with, then you cannot possibly do something. You are going to continue to be a drain on some social programs. And I reflect back this past summer, to the Oka situation. I do believe that if we let Canada know what is going on, if we let the people know what is going on, they will react.

If you had taken a poll the day after the incident in Oka, I think you would have got a much different opinion than we got, let's say, in September, when 72% of the people polled said, "Yes, I think we should deal with Indian crises, I think we should deal with the situation now with claims, I think we should move forward and deal with it." I do not think that is an accident though. The crisis itself was very quick; the crisis was not resolved quickly. It took a time. The media needed time, they needed filler. They did some historical backgrounding. They got some information that said, "Yes, maybe it is a legitimate grievance."

So I think if we establish what the ground rules are, if we let the Canadian public know what they are, if you let the Indian people know what they are and if they are legitimate and dealt with in that manner, Canada will be a much better place. If we listen to what the people are saying, Indian and non-Indian, and if we tell them what we plan to do with it, I think it will make a better Canada. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. There are a couple of questions, but let me first of all say to you that one thing has been clear in our hearings so far: the overwhelming consensus in favour of governments at all levels addressing issues of first nations' self-government and trying to pursue those problems. So I think there is a growing consensus there among our population on that.

Mr Malkowski: I certainly was impressed with your presentation. As we have travelled from city to city we have certainly got presentations from a variety of native

people who have talked about rights for self-government and so on. You seem to be identifying a problem of communication between the various levels of government and the native people. Should there be a position or a seat that would allow for the natives to have a formal place in government to bring their concerns? How would you feel about that, or a reserved seat for natives within the political system so that there would be a guaranteed voice?

Mr Jacobs: Personally, no, although I do know that some of our native leaders nationally indicate that that might be an appropriate use of the system. We are members of a constituency both provincially and federally, think if we use that properly, we can be heard. I think if we went the other way, where we said, "Yes, we will accept one seat in the federal legislature and one in the province of Ontario," it would be that: "You are an Indian. I am sorry. You have got your own minister or your own Member there you go see." So, no, personally I do not think that is a workable solution.

It would be hard nationally to do representation for the population because we are very small communities scattered all over the province and in the rest of Canada. That is my own personal opinion, but you may hear others.

Mr Offer: Chief Jacobs, you have spoken about number of issues. First, you have spoken about the need to settle land claims, and I think as a corollary to that you indicate that those particular land claims must recognize that they have to be of a sufficient area in order to have sufficient resource base to be self-sufficient.

You also speak in a second area about a growth of services within a particular reserve. Do you believe that these aspects can be achieved outside of constitutional amendment? Do you believe that they can be as a result of negotiation between either the provincial and federal or combination of both governments and without constitutional change?

Mr Jacobs: I think the grievances can be settled. I think there are sufficient cases, even though it is only 60 years with regard to claims nationally and the one or two every year we read about that the province of Ontario has settled with them. I think it can be done jointly between the province and the federal government.

Self-government: We are looking at claims and the settlement of claims only. We are looking at resource bases are generally the federal government. I would assume at the point in time the province would rather give money for the land, so your resource base is not going to necessarily expand. But with money you would have the opportunity to do something.

I think the type of thing that we are looking for and we are working towards is negotiation towards self-government. It would be a lot easier, I suppose, to get that legislated. However, in the long run, and we do tend to view the process as much longer than I guess a politician who only in for four years, we are looking at constitutional entrenchment of self-government.

Currently you have the Sechelt. You are looking at the James Bay agreement in Quebec, the legislation. They are having all kinds of problems with them. Some of the rights

at will come out of Supreme Court cases such as the Sparrow case, other decisions that may come as a result of that type of action will entrench some rights, and if we can have the two together, I think constitutional entrenchment is what we are looking for. Legislative change may be an interim step, but eventually constitutional entrenchment.

Mr Bisson: You mentioned in your presentation that the law, and in the Constitution to a certain extent, native rights have been recognized, but unfortunately they have not been put into practice, and the only way that has been done is by challenging it through the court system. We have heard a lot of people present, and the Chairman touched on it, during the whole time of these committee hearings, people talking about how we need to finally sit down and we need to recognize native people and native people's rights and we have to start working towards either self-government or whatever that mechanism might be. There seems to be quite a bit of goodwill out there.

Personally yourself, what is your sense of it? You know, you are hearing a lot of people now saying it is about time that we start dealing with it. Do you have a lot of confidence that at the end of the day, let's say, that the rights in regard to fishing will be settled but it means that some outfitter or some camper or some cottager may end up having to lose his right, or whatever it might be? How do you see that developing? Do you see that there will be enough goodwill to get us to the point that finally the native people will be able to basically control their own destiny and control their own programs?

Mr Jacobs: Given the history of progress, I guess probably not in my lifetime, but I see that there will be some movement towards that. You know, I was a bureaucrat at one time. I did work in the federal government, so I am aware of some of the processes and some of the delays that happen just because it is a bureaucracy. There is goodwill out there. There are certain rights that we have been claiming for numerous years. One local example is the fishing right, the Supreme Court case in British Columbia, the Sparrow case, that there is a right to fish for food. It took a local magistrate's decision here to recognize that we have that right. We still have another case at the Ontario Supreme Court level that could wipe that out again.

700

It seems that you win, you lose, you win, you lose. I do not know when the end of the day is, and it does not seem to me that anyone else does either. If we can identify them, we can live together. A community of 850 people fishing for food is not going to deplete the lakes out here. It never did before, and I do not see why it should now. We are not going to say that non-Indians should not fish in the lake, but we feel we have a legitimate claim to fish there. We are not saying, "You cut off this slice, and this is ours." We are saying that if we can fish for food, we do not care what colour you are when you come across in a boat.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Chief Jacobs.

CANADIAN ABORTION RIGHTS ACTION LEAGUE,
PETERBOROUGH CHAPTER

The Chair: I have been told that the next two groups representing have agreed to switch order, so I call next Mar-

garet Hobbs from the Peterborough chapter of the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League.

Ms Hobbs: I would like to thank you all for giving us the opportunity, all of us here, to speak to you today. My name is Margaret Hobbs and I am representing the Peterborough chapter of the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League. Our local chapter has been functioning since the fall of 1987, although as most of you are aware, CARAL has been a national organization for many years and has local chapters in communities across the country.

We exist as an organization primarily for two main reasons. We have wanted to get and now to keep abortion out of the Criminal Code of Canada, and we want to ensure that women in our community and in fact in all communities across the country have equal access to safe and affordable abortion services and to other related health care services.

What I want to do today is mainly to tell you something of what we believe in, and to highlight some of our key concerns about the present, and our fears and our hopes for the future. As feminists and as members of a national umbrella organization, we do not want to speak specifically just in terms of our concerns and needs as Ontarians. Rather, I think we speak first and foremost as feminist women who are dedicated in general to the principle of equality and to the principle that women, wherever they live, whatever their class or ethnic background, should have the right to control their own bodies and to make their own choices about health care matters. These are matters, we believe firmly, that concern only women and their doctors. Moreover, women of Canada have a right to expect a guaranteed standard of quality and affordable health services, again, wherever they live and whatever their social and economic background.

I want to emphasize our position. I want to emphasize that we are pro-choice, not pro-abortion. Some people who do not like us very much have called us pro-abortion, but it is important to recognize that this is really to misconstrue the fundamental basis of our position on abortion. We believe that individual women have a right to make reproductive decisions for themselves, in accordance with their own morality, their own circumstances, their own ethics. We support, therefore, a woman's decision to carry her foetus to term just as readily as we would support her decision to terminate the pregnancy. That, we feel, is the essence of choice.

I think it is clear that the majority of Canadians support our general position. I could cite many examples, but I will only cite one, and that is the 1988 Gallup poll which revealed that 71% of Canadians share our view that abortion is a private health matter between a woman and a doctor. The precise statistics on this question vary from poll to poll, of course, but it is important to realize that fairly consistently the pro-choice faction has come out on top in this question, in Peterborough and also nationally.

As you all know, the Senate has recently defeated the federal government's latest abortion bill, a bill which, if passed, would have recriminalized abortion and left the doctors performing abortions, as well as the women who are seeking abortion services, open to criminal action on the part of third parties. Obviously, we rejoice at the defeat

of this bill—that goes without saying. Thankfully, I think it marks the end of one round of fairly ugly attacks on women and on women's right to choose. This is a round of attacks that really began in earnest in the summer of 1989 when Barbara Dodd and Chantal Daigle's male partners attempted to force the continuation of their pregnancies through court injunctions.

Now that Canadians have successfully thwarted the government's attempts to recriminalize abortion, we have to turn our attention to the problem of women's access to this particular medical service and indeed to other health services. I want to point out that access to abortion was severely undermined after Bill C-43 was passed by Parliament. Many, many doctors right across the country, acting on the presumption that the bill would very soon become law, began withdrawing their services rather than face the prospect of an ugly criminal action.

In Sault Ste Marie, for example, the Algoma West Academy of Medicine announced that none of its members would perform abortions any more, so they advised women to go and get the service done in Toronto or northern Michigan. Referrals like this from northern Ontario and from other regions in the province have put a tremendous strain on Toronto's abortion services, and the result is that women in Toronto were having to wait for up to a month for government-funded abortions. This is a long waiting period. Prior to this, women were having to wait generally just 10 days to two weeks. That additional two weeks can mean a great difference to women.

In the Maritimes and in the Prairies access has similarly been further restricted and women are being forced to turn to American clinics, where abortions can run up to \$1,000 or more, and these are costs that are not covered by provincial plans.

If we presume that these access problems I have just summarized quickly will vanish now that the bill has been stopped, I think we will be mistaken. We can reasonably hope that many, or perhaps most, of the doctors who withdrew their services in light of the coming law will now begin performing abortions again. But it is likely that others may not. Once you have stopped providing a service, how can we guarantee that those doctors will continue to re-establish that service? I have a concern about that. But even if they do, even if all of the doctors who performed abortions before go back to performing them, we have to realize that as Bill C-43 did not create the access problem in the first place—it only made it worse—we cannot assume the access problem will simply disappear with the failure of this bill.

I want to outline in very broad strokes the access problem in our community here in Peterborough. The current situation for Peterborough women needing abortions is quite grim. Under the old law, the abortion law that was struck down by the Supreme Court in January 1988, women seeking abortions in Peterborough had to go through the therapeutic abortion committee of the Peterborough Civic Hospital. There were many problems with the law, not the least of which was the fact that it was a criminal law. It is ironic that more women could obtain

abortions locally in Peterborough when that law was in effect than they can now when there is no law in effect.

I am going to run very briefly through some statistics which will show you how local access has been deteriorating, particularly over the past several years. I do not want to bore you to death with statistics, but I will run through them quickly. This is the number of abortions performed at Peterborough Civic Hospital, which is where abortions in Peterborough are done. Right back to 1970, there were 35 abortions performed at the hospital. We jump ahead a decade to 1980 and we have 372, an increase; 1981, 330. Throughout the early 1980s, the numbers continue to increase, from 330 in 1981 to 342 in 1982; in 1983, a slight drop to 279; 1984, a very slight drop again to 249; in 1985 a further drop to 200; 1986, a drop to 171.

This is an important year, because this is the year that doctors went on strike to protest extra-billing, and many Peterborough doctors who once performed the service decided they would not perform it any longer because they could not extra-bill. While there were five doctors in Peterborough providing abortions, after extra-billing there were only two. In fact, only one does them regularly; the other does them on an ad hoc basis. The one doctor we do have is getting close to retirement age.

1710

So from 1986 with 172 abortions, we continue a decline to only 113 in 1987. In 1988, 76, a further drop. This is the year the old abortion law was struck down. The next year, 1989, we went up a slight bit to 90 abortions, but even though 90 abortions were performed we know that that year at least 131 women from Peterborough had to go to Toronto for their abortions. For 1990, we only have figures for three months, which show there were 38 abortions done. None the less, in 1990 we know abortion access continued to be very bad in Peterborough.

Over the summer, when one of the two doctors who can do abortions was away for the holidays, a full two-thirds of local women had to go outside Peterborough at their own expense to get an abortion. Now that both of them are somewhat resuming their services, about 15 abortions are done per month locally, but eight to 10 women a month have to go to Toronto. These are very rough statistics but they tell a story certainly. From the statistics we have been able to gather, some 40% of the women seeking abortions in Peterborough have to travel outside their own community to get a procedure which is a legal medical service.

What does all this mean for women in practical terms? The cost of an abortion done at one of the freestanding clinics in Toronto is \$200 to \$250, money not reimbursed by OHIP. Costs can be even higher, perhaps up to \$650, if the woman's pregnancy is more advanced and she has to go to one of the few centres that handle second-trimester abortions. She has to pay her own travelling expenses; she must take time away from school or work or other obligations in order to have the procedure done out of town. For some it means you have to find somebody to take you there; a companion to drive you there and take you home again. All of these kinds of arrangements mean it can be more difficult to maintain confidentiality about this issue.

when you go out of town than it is in town. You might think it would be the reverse.

Having to go to Toronto for our Peterborough women is especially difficult for younger women who do not have many financial resources, and it is also especially difficult for unemployed women or low-income women, whatever the reason, because they simply do not have the finances to foot the bill. So we have a situation in Peterborough where women have to travel outside their community to attain a legal procedure that technically is covered by OHIP. We know the need for abortions is not diminishing in this community and elsewhere. What is decreasing is access to abortion services.

We at CARAL Peterborough are alarmed, really alarmed, at the great variation in the availability of abortion services and the quality of those services from community to community and also from province to province. In the past few years the federal government has shown absolutely no willingness to use the Canada Health Act to penalize provinces which withhold access to abortion and abortion-related services or try to restrict them to particular groups of women or under particular circumstances. We fear their inactivity really signals a major threat to the fundamental principles underlying our whole national health care system.

With most other Canadians, we view with alarm the gradual dilution of any federal government commitment to national standards for health care services, and abortion is one of those services. As Canadians, I think we all value and take pride in our national health care system. With any other Canadians, we at CARAL are concerned about any impacts future constitutional negotiations might have on the health care services in general, although, of course, our particular focus will be on how it might affect the provision of abortion and other related health services for women.

We are especially concerned that Quebec is demanding complete control over its health care system, and we are concerned about how Brian Mulroney will respond to that kind of demand and the demand, potentially, by other provinces. Brian Mulroney has promised us that accessibility to health care will not be jeopardized in any future provincial-federal negotiations, but I think we have reason to worry that medicare itself is in the process of being dismantled, as Carol Gore recently warned us in her national affairs column in the *Toronto Star* of 19 February.

Yesterday's budget release is not at all reassuring in this regard, for the announced cuts in transfer payments to the provinces will undoubtedly have a serious impact on the ability of the provinces to provide quality accessible health care services.

To sum up, I have outlined our concerns about what could be considered a crisis in access to abortion services, both here in Peterborough and in many, many other communities. I have emphasized the importance of a strong federal commitment to ensuring women have access to abortion and other health services and to services that follow uniform standards in all the provinces. What we would like to see is a strengthening of the government's commitment to medicare in general and to women's health

services in particular, rather than what appears to be happening, which is a gradual dilution of the Canada Health Act and, along with it, the dilution of national health standards altogether.

We would ask that you keep our concerns for the health and reproductive rights of women in mind at the upcoming federal-provincial negotiations. The women of Peterborough, and indeed the women of Canada, are really counting on you to make our voices heard and to make our needs and our fundamental rights known.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Hobbs. We have gone beyond the time, so we have to move on.

PETERBOROUGH COLLEGIATE AND VOCATIONAL INSTITUTE

The Chair: I call next the group of students from Peterborough Collegiate: Sasha Miller, Luke Tromly, Alison Watson and Dom Jaikaran.

Ms Miller: Good afternoon. My name is Sasha Miller. We are four honours students at Peterborough Collegiate, and we are just here to voice our opinions on certain aspects of Canada and the future.

To open, we would like to say we do not feel we are knowledgeable enough to give polished arguments with force behind them on Canada's present state. Our adviser received very late notice, thus giving us little time to form this committee. We do, however, have opinions on certain aspects of Canada's future, but before we come to that, we thought perhaps we should point out that students today are basically poorly informed about Canada's situation and where it may go in the future. When we were asked to give our feelings on these issues our immediate reaction was: "I don't think I know enough about it to speak about it. Perhaps you have the wrong person." With that in mind, please bear with us and hear what we have to say.

Mr Jaikaran: Good afternoon. I am Dom Jaikaran and I will be addressing the question of Quebec in the future of Canada.

I find that students of today are very tolerant of Quebec, but we do not know why or where we stand on most of the issues. More or less, the students are very confused over Quebec and the future of Canada. We have grown up with Quebec, we have taken French all the way through the system, we have participated in French exchanges, we have taken French immersion and we have been forced to accept the French culture.

Most of us are of the opinion that Quebec should stay with Canada and we became very upset at the thought of Quebec leaving. We feel the French culture adds a lot to Canada in ways that cannot be replaced. It is very interesting that most of the students want Quebec to stay, and most adults, as well as myself, think if it wants to leave we should let it leave.

We came to the conclusion that students, because they are so ill informed, base their decisions on gut feelings, whereas adults, who are better informed, tend to overlook gut feelings and base their decisions on the information they have gained from various media sources.

I myself, as well as many other people in Canada, would very much like Quebec in Canada, but I do not

think we should have to put up with all its demands. They ask us to be equal and fair by learning French but they are not willing to have any English signs hanging in their streets. They must be willing to make a move as well. The system has to work both ways.

1720

Mr Tromly: Good afternoon. My name is Luke Tromly, and this afternoon I would like to talk about the relationship between Canada and the United States. I really have no authority to speak on this subject besides the fact that my parents are American, but I was born in Canada, so it is interesting for me to see what is going on between the two countries, in my family as well as in the whole country.

There has always been an anti-American sentiment among young people of Canada. I think these days that sentiment has kind of grown weaker and died down. I think there are a couple of reasons for this. The first is free trade and the fact that the trade barrier has been eliminated between the two countries. Second, I think young people feel that there is a real lack of kind of Canadian symbols that represent a Canadian identity. For example, two symbols that came to mind were the recent cuts in the CBC and also the trans-Canada railroad that I think kind of diminish Canada's identity as a country.

A third reason is the values that Canada as a country holds. I think the most important value for me, the Canadian value, is the fact that Canada is a fairly pacifist country and neutral, and I think that is really changing. For example, if you look at the recent crisis in the Gulf, Canadian war policy has been determined by the actions of the United States, which is not a particularly pacifist country and I think is making Canada act in a way that is detrimental to the idea behind Canada. For example, to find out what was going on in the Gulf, I watched an American news station, and that station told me more about Canada's actions in the Gulf than anything else, because Bush's policies are Mulroney's policies.

I think Canada should be independent from the United States. I think it would be more beneficial for both countries for Canada to maintain its independence. I have recently had an argument saying that the only way Canada can maintain its independence is to become a neutral state like Switzerland. I know that is not very realistic, but it shows that Canada has always had a hard time maintaining its identity with the United States.

Going back to the beginning of my statement when I said that the anti-US sentiment has really died down in Canada, in a way that is good. I mean, I am not here to propose some sort of hatred of the United States. I do not think that is good for Canada. However, the fact that Canada is now more amicable towards the United States shows that Canada is really in a situation where we could be enveloped by the United States quite easily. I think we are in a situation and a state of mind where we could lose our independence quite quickly.

As I said before, I am against that and I think the only way for Canada to maintain its independence is for the Mulroney government to adjust its policies, its foreign policies and its domestic policies, to enforce Canadian businesses,

Canadian jobs and Canadian independence, and also to try and re-establish independent Canadian values and attitudes which would help differentiate us from the United States.

Ms Miller: Okay, this is just our position on free trade and our fears of free trade. Once again, we do not know whole lot about it, but as students, we cannot yet see the effects of free trade with the US and it will probably take many years for all the benefits and the problems to come to the surface.

We feel that free trade with Quebec, if Quebec were to leave, would probably be impossible, as there may be too many hard feelings or tension between Quebec and Canada maybe even malice.

We have a few concerns about free trade with the United States at this present time. Will not the continuance of free trade to a degree take away from the individuality of Canada? We do realize that this is in progress and there is really not a whole lot we can do to change it, but is free trade not just one step closer to having unified Canada with the United States?

We also fear the free trade agreement with the United States because it is just, you know, a more powerful country than we are. Perhaps if we were in a free trade agreement with Mexico or even another country as well, the United States would not have such a chance to dominate.

I also was reading the green and white booklets that have been going around on the emergence of the large economic blocs which is stated in it as a possible decision for the future. We feel that it may take away from Canada's individuality, but the way the European common market is coming together, it is probably an inevitable decision on Canada's part.

Ms Watson: Good afternoon, panel members. My name is Alison Watson. I will sum up the opinions of my group on the subject of Canada's future.

We feel that Canada is unique and that it was founded by and made up of many distinct cultures. Whether or not these cultures will divide up into many distinct societies remains to be seen, but what we feel is special and attractive about Canada is that up until the last three decades, these cultures have been able to coexist in relative comfort. We would like this good relationship to continue.

The United States is often compared to Canada because of its geographical proximity, similar size, similar culture and similar history. But the United States of America is a melting pot. Many diverse people come to America and drop their collective cultural identities at the borders and one would drop one's coat at the door upon entering the house. Once inside the country, they become homogeneous. They are Americans; again, this new cultural identity at the price of losing their old cultural tradition.

On the other hand, Canadians are free to enjoy the identity as Canadians as well as any other heritage they may have without feeling like traitors to their country. In fact, Canadians overall seem to have a less aggressive pride in their country, which is often sadly mistaken for ambivalence.

The future we envision for Canada is one in which a citizens may express their cultural heritage, practise the

own religion and speak their own language, but not inflict them on others. Canada has historically been a very tolerant country and we see no reason why it should not continue to be so.

The future of Canada is in our—the students'—hands, but we are not adequately informed to handle it. The government is slowly responding to the need for more public education with hearings such as this and public discussion papers such as these. Also, with further public education campaigns, Canadians will feel more secure in Canada's future and will be more inclined to take action.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our opinions. Does the panel have any questions of any members of the group?

The Chair: I am sure there are. Actually, I want to start with one. Thank you very much for your comments. You have said that you have not had much of an opportunity to talk and think about some of these things, but you have given us none the less some very clear positions and clear views, and sometimes it is really from the gut; in fact, a sensible, if not more sensible, rationalizing out. None the less, I wanted to ask you what you thought we can do as politicians, particularly within the school system but in any other way, to ensure that young people like yourselves can become better informed and can become more involved in some of these things.

Ms Watson: One thing that would be effective in school assemblies, perhaps something similar to this, like a forum format travelling around to various schools. I would like to say that the four of us were very pleased to be invited to speak here. These booklets, the public discussion papers, are very effective. This program is very effective and the media coverage I think will help a lot to educate people, not just young people but all of Ontario's people on issues such as these.

Mr Tromly: I think in addition probably more of a debate forum to talk about government policies would be appropriate, because usually when we hear about a government policy we hear the one side of the issue, the issue of the party that is trying to get the bill passed or whatever. By debating it among students, we could probably get a better idea of what these policies entail and how appropriate they are for the country.

Ms Miller: I think perhaps students are afraid to touch this. They do not understand enough and they just say: "Okay, I won't think about it. I won't do anything about it." If we generalize it, make it easier for them to understand, booklets like this are good, but still you probably would not find the average student picking one up and reading it. We did because we had to prepare for this. Otherwise, I probably would not have. Something, I do not know, interesting, art in it or something that would catch a teenager's attention. As well I think assemblies are a big, important deal for students.

Mr Jaikaran: I agree with most of the opinions that have been stated, especially with the one about the future of Canada. When I first heard about this debate, I was kind of turned off and backed away from it a bit. But more or less make the talks and education like you want it, because

most people like to hear about it and they hear it on the news and they hear at home and they pick up a Maclean's magazine and it is on the cover, but they just put it down. So a different way to look at things, and I think school assemblies would be a good way to do that or even a section of a course, like maybe a grade 10 course that takes the government of Canada and what is going to happen. I feel that we anyway have not been really informed about the future of Canada and we have not had a role in doing anything about it and expressing our opinions.

Mr F. Wilson: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, for the fine presentation. We have had many groups come before us, students younger than yourselves and the various groups too. Each group preamble their presentation by apologizing for their lack of knowledge and their lack of experience. I think it is time that we just told you to talk plain. I am very impressed by the groups that have come before us. Really, I do not know why we are impressed. We should be more aware.

Second, one of us usually says about this time that part of what we are doing is because you are going to inherit what we leave for you. I also think that is a little bit redundant now, because I believe you have already inherited it.

My question was in fact along the same line as Mr Silipo's: How can we get students more involved? What would you like to see, that we can do as a government, as personal, private MPPs, to make students of our different constituencies and areas more involved in it? I will not ask that question again. What I will do is to challenge you, though, perhaps to go back and talk to your colleagues in school and perhaps formulate the kind of ideas around that.

If it means access to government ministries, if it means access to MPPs, they are readily available. The information that you request is there somewhere. I would challenge you to go back perhaps and consider it is already yours. Therefore, you have a responsibility—I should think a duty—in helping to make it better or helping in the mechanism to make it better. Then perhaps get in contact with whoever happens to be your MP federally or provincial MPP, or somehow with the ministry, to make that information part of the action.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We are hoping that this has become a centre of discussion in some history classes, English classes, that some people will actually do some papers on it and that they will pass them on to us.

Your presentation has a little bit of a different slant, for me at least, because you talked more about the United States. I think three out of the four of you were quite explicit about the role of the United States and how closely we are associated with what we have often called the elephant and ourselves the mouse. Of course, I can see why you feel that way because you are not that far from the border. Especially with the war on, there is much more talk about the US.

But Luke particularly mentioned that he thinks there should be more symbols, something that makes us more distinctively Canadian, and I think one of you mentioned the free trade agreement as well and that we must preserve the Canadian part of that economy that brought us to the

table and maybe broaden that. So I wonder if you would like to talk about some ways in which you think we can remain distinct, because the threat has always been there and will continue to be throughout your lifetime.

Mr Tromly: First, I would like to agree with you in that the threat has always been there, especially, I think, for young people because, as has been said, we do not really play an active part in the government of this country. And, because we feel we do not really have a say, the threat of the elephant stepping on the mouse is very real to us.

Second, when I did talk about Canadian symbols, the point I was trying to make was not that we should make symbols for the sake of having something distinctly Canadian. I think the lack of symbols is telling, but false symbols will not get us anywhere. You are right, though, in that Canada has always lacked the stars and stripes. Where America has the Statue of Liberty, we have Wayne Gretzky. Canadian patriotism is not as strong as in the United States.

To answer your question of what symbols would help establish a Canadian identity, I do not really know. We are in a tough time right now because national unity is very shaky. I do not know if national unity can be saved by a picture of a beaver or something like that, but it is tough to say. You cannot give symbols meaning. They have to mean something on their own, and right now to Canadian youth and Canadians in general I question how many Canadian symbols have a strong meaning.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We had a suggestion last night that we change some of the pictures on our currency. Maybe you saw that.

Mr Tromly: The Mila Mulroney \$10 bill or something.

The Chair: There were a couple of our names, actually.

Ms Churley: Somebody mentioned early on, and the Chair spoke to it, that you do not know a whole lot about this so you are speaking more from your emotional viewpoint and do not have all the facts. I just want to say that a lot of adults do not have the facts and that I think that you have identified a problem. That is one of the things we were hoping to do, cause a dialogue to happen so people understand.

I wanted to ask a question about that to do with Quebec. Everybody knows about the sign problems over stores, etc, but it seems to me that a lot of people are not really aware that, for instance, in Quebec, English Canadians, the minorities there, students like yourself, have an access to education that French minorities here do not have. There is all kinds of information and lack of clarity between the provinces about that, and I am wondering if you have had an opportunity to talk to any Quebec students and if you are interested in finding out more about the real facts around the issues that have come up between Quebec and English Canada.

Mr Jaikaran: I am not quite clear on the Quebec issue, but I feel there are bad things the government is doing to Quebec, and I think some of the things that Quebec is doing back it is being quite stubborn about. My position, and I do not feel quite confident in talking about

it, is that Quebec wants all this and some of the stuff is very justified and it should get it, but other provinces do not have this big thing about leaving Canada if they do not get what they want. Quebec was part of Canada when it was formed in Confederation. If Quebec gets this, another province will say, "We want this," and it seems right now we are in a crisis and national unity is the best thing for the country. But I am not quite sure. I am a student. I feel very strongly that if Quebec does not want to be part of Canada it should leave, but there are other opinions. I just do not feel very confident talking about that.

Mr Bisson: Could I just ask a very quick question?

The Chair: Very quickly, if you can.

1740

Mr Bisson: Just a yes or no, each of you. Do you have any confidence with regard to Canada's future?

Ms Watson: Yes. Would you like me to qualify that or—

Mr Bisson: It is up to you.

Ms Watson: I think Canada will survive in one form or another. As to Canada's surviving in its present form no. I think it has reached a straining point. The last 30 years, beginning with the liberation of Quebec campaign in the early 1960s—I think it is coming to a culmination now where things like this are going to determine what is going to happen. Yes, I believe Canada will continue to be but in a radically altered state.

Ms Miller: I agree with Alison. There is no way it will be able to continue the way it is right now. It has to change. What changes obviously will be determined later but I agree with her in that it will change.

Mr Jaikaran: My opinions have already been stated by the previous two.

Mr Tromly: I have a kind of confidence for the future, an uneasy confidence. It is true that Canada may well enter the future in a different form and I think a lot of Canada's future depends on how hard Canadians want to work to improve the future and how much we believe in the future of Canada individually.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

LOVESICK LAKE NATIVE WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION

The Chair: I call our final speakers for this afternoon Brenda Anstey and Beverly Brown from the Lovesick Lake Native Women's Association.

Mrs Anstey: I would like to thank everyone involved in the organization of this forum for allowing me to present the concerns of the Lovesick Lake Native Women's Association. Our association is based in Burleigh Falls, 33 kilometres north of Peterborough. We have a population of approximately 150 native and non-native residents.

When we look at Canada as a whole we see a country full of opportunity, at least for those who have the ability to reach out and take a piece. Unfortunately, not everyone has this ability. Some of us have not had the opportunity to function in society due to several factors, factors which

include stereotyping, racism, low social standing, lack of education, etc.

Our association, of which I am president, has been attempting for the past nine years to assist people in overcoming such barriers. This has not been an easy task and changes do not occur overnight. People need to be encouraged to make changes that will lead to a brighter future with positive outcomes.

In 1982 a group of concerned women formed the association specifically to address the social, cultural and economic needs of our community. It was realized that the urban service agencies could not effectively extend their services to our rural area. We had a multitude of problems we had to deal with, problems which included alcohol abuse, drug abuse, low education levels, etc. There was a lot of idle time. There were no employment opportunities. Everything was at a complete standstill.

With a clear sense of direction, we set out to reverse the negative cycle our community was trapped in. Since our incorporation, we have provided, through volunteer efforts, over 400 jobs in the community—they had been short term. The services have been extended to reach out into Harvey township, Smith township and Burleigh-Anstruther, which covers quite a population.

Our services include a youth employment counselling service, a Futures program, an adult learning centre, summer student programs which we administer every summer. We have employment and training opportunities, ongoing programs short-term, and were responsible for the development of the EduCon carpentry training program. That program runs for three years, and over the period of a year it takes 30 people in and gives them the opportunity to get apprenticeship training.

Lovesick Lake has a mandate to create employment and educational opportunities for all people in the area. We have been very successful in our short-term job creation attempts and attribute our success to an excellent knowledge of available funding sources, both provincial and federal, our ability to negotiate with government, to operate programs effectively and to maximize the use of local available human resources.

Our board of directors consists of five women. We have been commended and recognized for our volunteer efforts, for our invaluable contribution of services to the area. Although this recognition is well received, we feel the following issues with regard to funding need to be addressed.

1. We have over the years recognized the fact that many of the available programs are a duplication of services being provided by both federal and provincial governments.
2. Eligibility criteria guidelines are restrictive and do not necessarily reflect the needs of the local rural community. Programs administered at the community level do not receive sufficient funds to administer and cover all program costs. Non-profit organizations such as ours are not eligible to receive an administration fee for delivery of programs. This causes financial hardship. Although we do a lot of fund-raising, we have fund-raising events, the money we raise is minimal. Multipurpose organizations have no means of obtaining moneys through current program

mechanisms to provide core staffing. We have over the years obtained a large number of programs through volunteer efforts, and the administration, the overseeing of the programs, has been all provided through volunteer efforts.

With regard to the concerns I have just presented, we would like the elected representatives to initiate a program that would provide recognition and financial support to rural community-based organizations that encourage social and economic reform. We as Canadian citizens share a common will, the desire to function in a democratic society free of discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, race or colour, gender or disability.

Within the native culture there are four values that direct and influence our lives. These values are honesty, sharing and caring, strength and kindness. Without this form of guidance, we could not have accomplished all we have.

In closing, I would like to acknowledge the participation of the Ontario select committee members.

1750

Ms Churley: I love your name, Lovesick Lake Native Women's Association. I would love to know how you came to that particular name.

Mrs Anstey: When we were sitting around discussing what we should call our association, we thought rather than the Burleigh Falls Native Women's Association we should go with a name that has impact, that people will remember, and we just happen to be situated between Lovesick Lake and Stony Lake. We thought Stony Lake Native Women's—there is nothing to that—so it was Lovesick Lake Native Women's; people will remember that.

Ms Churley: People will remember, it is true. It showed up on another agenda one time and the people did not arrive, but I never forgot the name. I know I was really disappointed they did not show up.

I just want to ask you very briefly about how much native women are involved in the hierarchy of the process within your communities, ie, there are a lot of chiefs who I think are mostly male and of course most of our politicians are male and we are trying to change that, and if that is an issue and if women within your communities are involved in some of the treaty negotiations and the larger political arena.

Mrs Anstey: We have really tried to stay out of the political circle because we have a lot of issues within the community that need to be dealt with—economic, social development—so up to just recently we have not really taken a broad look at all of that.

Ms Churley: But it is something you would be interested in, in your role: the social kinds of problems and the context of the larger political area, I guess, tied together.

Mrs Anstey: Just recently we have attended a couple of workshops with the Ontario Native Women's Association and we have attended the Iroquois and Allied Indians' Association, so we are becoming involved in that circle now.

Mr Offer: You have spoken about the type of service you provide and the difficulties you are experiencing in terms of the duplication and eligibility requirements and how necessary the services are. At the end of your presentation you spoke of a way in which your problems in providing

service could be rectified and I just wrote it down. It seemed to me to be almost a central type of organization and I am wondering if you have prepared anything in a formal sense that we might want to take a look at.

Mrs Anstey: I have nothing with me right now, but we can supply it.

Mr Offer: I certainly think it would be very helpful for the committee to first appreciate the needs, how you are meeting them and how you suggest you can improve on the existing process. I think that would be very helpful to us, so I would encourage you to send that in to us.

Mrs Anstey: I do have right now a brochure.

The Chair: If you leave that with us we can provide copies. If you would like to send us anything, we can make sure you have our address.

ASSOCIATION DES ENSEIGNANTES ET DES ENSEIGNANTS FRANCO-ONTARIENS

The Chair: Members of the committee, there is one additional organization that would like to present and I think it is easier for us to fit them in this afternoon than it will be this evening, so with your acceptance I will call them forward now—Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens; Anne Patenaude.

Mlle Patenaude : Bonjour. J'espère pouvoir parler plus fort que vos estomacs. Je suis Anne Patenaude et je suis représentante de l'AEFO, l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens, unité secondaire. Je vous ferai le rapport et Pierre Riopel viendra m'aider pour répondre aux questions.

Nous remercions le comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération d'accorder ces quelques minutes à l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens, aussi connue sous le sigle de l'AEFO, unité secondaire de Durham, qui s'est crue dans l'obligation de réagir à la présente impasse constitutionnelle. Cette toute nouvelle unité oeuvre auprès des jeunes de Pickering, d'Ajaj, de Whitby, d'Oshawa, de Peterborough et des communautés environnantes depuis quatre ans. L'unité est endossée par l'AEFO provinciale qui compte présentement au-delà de 6000 membres.

L'AEFO provinciale, et plus particulièrement l'unité secondaire de Durham, a pour but de protéger individuellement et collectivement ses membres pour assurer le respect de tous leurs droits dans l'exercice de leur profession, de promouvoir une meilleure éducation des francophones en Ontario et de promouvoir l'épanouissement professionnel de ses membres. En tant que porte-parole de cette unité, je vous soumets ce mémoire. Nos membres auraient souhaité que les circonstances nous aient permis d'élaborer d'avantage cette question qui nous tient tellement à coeur.

Nous croyons que l'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle prépondérant dans les discussions actuelles, étant donné son pouvoir économique, son importance démographique et son leadership politique. Les membres de notre association sont grandement inquiets au sujet de l'échec de l'accord du Lac Meech, des disparités régionales et sociales en Ontario et au Canada en entier, du mouvement souverainiste qui prend de plus en plus d'ampleur au Québec et des gestes

d'intolérance et d'injustice posés par plusieurs municipalités de la province de l'Ontario en 1990. Cet état de choses remet en question l'existence même du Canada.

En tant qu'Ontariennes et Ontariens et en tant que membres d'une communauté linguistique minoritaire nous trouvons cette situation particulièrement alarmante. Nous sommes une communauté vibrante qui cherche à se faire une place dans la grande communauté canadienne et comprend l'Ontario, le Québec, l'Alberta, la Colombie britannique, l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard et tous les autres membres de la Confédération.

Il est grand temps de souligner nos ressemblances plutôt que de mettre l'accent sur nos différences. Nous sommes tous Canadiennes et Canadiens premièrement et avant tout. Ne perdons pas la chance de bénéficier des atouts que nous confèrent deux langues officielles en s'ignorant l'un l'autre.

Les francophones de l'Ontario bénéficient de certaines améliorations majeures depuis un quart de siècle. Cette situation doit se maintenir afin de marcher au pas du progrès.

La Loi sur les services en français adoptée unanimement par l'Assemblée législative en 1986 offre une gamme de services à plus d'un demi-million de francophones habitant dans certaines régions désignées de l'Ontario. Nous demandons que les efforts de la province de l'Ontario soient poursuivis et intensifiés en désignant la région de Durham selon les termes de cette Loi. Plus spécifiquement en tant que responsables de l'éducation franco-ontarienne il devient de plus en plus évident aux membres de l'AEFO que seule la pleine gestion de nos institutions scolaires peut assurer la survie de nos communautés francophones.

Les conseils scolaires homogènes de langue française des régions d'Ottawa-Carleton et de Toronto métropolitain sont des signes tangibles de la bonne volonté du gouvernement provincial. La présentation du projet de loi 12 par le gouvernement Rae est positive. La création d'autres conseils homogènes est un besoin essentiel. Le succès indéniable de la Cité collégiale, premier collège communautaire francophone en Ontario, démontre évidemment le besoin pressant de mettre sur pied des structures semblables dans les régions actuellement mal desservies. Enfin les discussions et les pourparlers qui portent sur la création d'une université franco-ontarienne doivent être menés à terme. Il est complètement logique que la personne franco-ontarienne voulant s'éduquer dans sa langue maternelle puisse le faire tout au long de sa vie. Il est important d'assurer une qualité de vie à tous et à toutes dans la langue officielle de son choix.

Les enseignantes et les enseignants de la région de Durham ne pourront répondre pleinement aux aspirations et aux besoins des jeunes francophones que si les recommandations soumises dans le cadre de ce mémoire soient considérées pour leur juste valeur. Nous sommes très conscients du travail gigantesque que le comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération aura à faire dans les prochains mois. Lors de vos délibérations, nous vous prions de bien vouloir considérer les recommandations suivantes :

Que l'Ontario puisse avoir le rôle d'un des protagonistes dans les décisions qui seront prises. Il va de soi que l'Ontario, pour donner un tel rôle, doit déclarer la région

le Durham officiellement bilingue en vertu de la Loi sur les services en français et que, ultimement, la province entière soit ainsi désignée.

Que la pleine gestion de nos institutions scolaires soit déléguée aux Franco-Ontariennes et aux Franco-Ontariens après tant d'années d'attente.

Nous vivons des situations délicates et difficiles. Afin de fournir une relève canadienne capable d'envisager les défis de demain, l'Ontario doit se frayer une place de

choix au sein de la Confédération, une place de leadership. Nous espérons ici faire avancer notre histoire collective.

M. le Président : Merci. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ? Any questions?

Mlle Patenaude : C'est tellement complet. Merci.

The Chair: We will now then recess and come back at 7 o'clock for the evening session.

The committee recessed at 1800.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1905.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. Thank you very much and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to this our evening session of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation from the council chambers at city hall in Peterborough.

We are happy to be here this evening, continuing in our hearings across the province. We have heard from a number of people here this afternoon, a number of organizations in particular. This evening we will be hearing primarily from a number of individuals here in the Peterborough area, and we want to just say that because of the number of people who have asked to be added to the list to speak, what we are going to do is to ask all the speakers to limit themselves to five minutes.

We realize that may hamper. Quite frankly, we can do it in one of two ways: we can either stick to the printed list and go with the time lines that we had offered, and that means that the other people will not be heard, or in order to give more people an opportunity to be heard, we are going to have to ask people to limit themselves.

We have time constraints that we are working under. We will not be able to go past 9:15 this evening because we have an early start tomorrow morning as well, so we are trying to do our best to accommodate as many people as we can. Again we apologize for the inconvenience that causes, but in our experience it has been better to give people a few minutes rather than give nothing at all. And so in that way, we hope it is of some use. I will say with that, that there will be some further opportunities for this discussion. This is not a one-time thing. There are going to be other opportunities for people to be able to participate in this process.

One of the things we will be doing as we put together our interim report is looking at how we can structure in fact from further discussions, because we understand the need for people across the province to be given an opportunity to continue talking to us and with us about these issues.

J. DOUGLAS HINDSON

The Chair: With that then, I would like to begin with the first speaker on our list, Doug Hindson.

Mr Hindson: I would like to begin at first of all thank you for this opportunity of appearing before you this evening and I will keep my introduction very short considering the time constraints. I have, I might add, prepared a submission which is rather lengthy and I gather will be reviewed by researchers. While I had not intended my address to be of short duration, it will force me to deal with what I think is the most important aspect of my concerns.

If I may, I would like to begin at the role of language in our society. Without doubt, the French language and culture have been important to Canadian growth, and, if anything, are probably the most distinguishing characteristic of Canada. Indeed, the French language in Quebec has never been stronger. As was stated recently in an article appearing in

the Ottawa Citizen, written by francophone academics, the greatest danger to French language today is not in the need to place additional restrictions and enforcements, but rather in the manner in which the language is spoken. Those of you who have lived in Quebec might be familiar with that concern. I might add that I have had the privilege of living there, as I have lived across Canada in seven of the 10 provinces.

Modern-day Canada is made up of many cultural and linguistic groups, all of whom have made their distinctive and individual contribution to the richness of this country. The continued growth and vitality of our country relies not in granting of special rights and privileges to any one group, either English or French or any other linguistic group. The blunt reality of our North American societies is that we reside in an English-language environment. To further policies which attempt to fight this reality will not only be doomed to failure, but will also prevent us from establishing cohesiveness of purpose with which to effectively survive in this shrinking and most highly competitive world.

Canada and Ontario should encourage all of its citizens to retain their own linguistic and cultural heritage. Observing the many cultures which now make up our country, I believe most practice and guard their heritage in a most admirable way, while joining in the mainstream of our economic society, sharing the same rights and privileges of all Canadians. Granting any special rights or privileges to Quebec will only lead to further angst among the rest of the population.

I wish I could be more optimistic about the role of Quebec in Canada. Given the concerns and the mood that seems to prevail in Quebec today, I am not particularly optimistic. Certainly the way to ensure Quebec's remaining part of the Confederation does not lie in the granting of further powers and concessions. Past experience and wisdom indicate that the more they are granted, the sooner they will be back seeking more. Perhaps you might consider the words of William Thorsell, the Globe and Mail's editor-in-chief writing in the Globe and Mail's Report on Business where he says: "Somewhere in the midst of all this, the question occurs, is so much really wrong with Canada? Have we somehow talked ourselves into a false crisis, indulgently and carelessly?" I wonder if we have.

Further I agree with Mr Mulroney that Canada is not negotiable. We have already stated that a "distinct society" clause for Quebec is not acceptable. Having said that, however, I emphasize that from my personal perspective this is not a rejection of Quebec, its society or its language. Quebec must decide on its future on the basis that it cannot be both separate and yet remain economically and politically affiliated with Canada.

Frankly, we do not offer associate memberships. If we are unable to convince Quebec, and the population of Quebec, that its best chance for survival, its best chance at economic prosperity, lies not in separation but in joining Canada, joining a family of Canadians, if however we are

not able to convince them of this, I have laid out five concerns or five positions I think we need to consider beginning with.

1. We must stress that sovereignty-association is simply not acceptable.

2. If Quebec departs, it should do so only with the territory it brought to Confederation. The Abitibi lands once held by the Hudson's Bay Company and granted Quebec in 1898, and the Ungava territory granted Quebec in 1912, remain part of Canada. The decision of the Privy Council in London of 1927 concerning Labrador must stand.

3. Quebec must leave Confederation totally and absolutely. There can be no kind of monetary union.

4. The St. Lawrence Seaway is of strategic national interest to Canada and must remain solely under our control.

5. The proportionate share of the federal indebtedness must be paid by Quebec before any recognition of formal separation. Indeed, Quebec's statement that it will not negotiate with anyone but the federal government implies that it is already a sovereign power.

Frankly all provinces in Canada are stakeholders in this nation. I suggest that all provincial politicians, all provincial premiers must be players on the negotiating team. I will even go so far as to suggest perhaps that Clyde Wells and Elijah Harper co-chair. Mr Wells, I believe, is probably one of the most popular Canadians today, having the greatest degree of respect for his steadfastness during the negotiations on Meech Lake.

The Chair: Sir, perhaps you could sum up please.

Mr Hindson: Remaining in Confederation does not preclude Quebec from retaining its language and culture. Similarly they cannot deny any other ethnic group the right to do the same.

In conclusion, I believe that Ontarians are looking for national unity. After all Canada is the sum of its parts, not of individual provinces or regions. We are all in it together. It is my fervid hope that our leaders are able to convince the people of Quebec that joining our family is in everyone's best interests.

WILFRED A. DAY

The Chair: I call next Wilfred A. Day.

Mr Day: Ladies and gentleman, we are not here just to talk constitutional law. Social and economic rights are as important as legal rights. The right to an adequate standard of living, and many other things, should be in our Constitution. Otherwise we are no further ahead than when the famous statement was made that, "The law, in its majestic concern for equality, forbids the rich and poor alike from sleeping under bridges."

So before we look at constitutional mechanisms, we should start with what people want most, a strong country in the social and economic sense. That country is Canada, not Confederation. Many people talk as though Canada and Confederation are the same thing. You might help unlock a few doors if you said clearly that this is not so. The real country was here before Confederation, and if Quebec keeps going in its present direction, we will soon learn that it may well be here after Confederation.

Canada of course evolved. But if we have to pick a time when it started, we could say this: We were that orderly part of British North America which did not join the American Revolution. In 1763, by the royal proclamation, we cemented our alliance with the aboriginal peoples. In 1774, by the Quebec Act, the English took the French as equal partners. By no coincidence, when the first Continental Congress met in Philadelphia later that same year, Canada declined the invitation to attend. Without these events, this peaceful and civilized country would likely not exist.

There have been many changes in Canada since then. In 1791 Ontario seceded from Quebec and we have tried running a colonial semi-sovereign association with Quebec, marked with disputes about the St. Lawrence canals and tariffs. In 1840 we rejoined Quebec. In 1867 we joined the Maritimes in Confederation, and of course there have been many more changes since. But the point is, Canada is much older than 1867 and it is much older than Confederation. So if we can make our economy and society work for the people, if we can make the economic links work, then we can make the legal and constitutional structure work.

If Quebec ends up putting forward some new kind of Canadian union, Canada may well keep living long after Confederation has died. You probably cannot propose this. That might be premature and presumptuous. But you can point out our first and foremost goal, that the real social and economic Canada, the alliance with the French and the aboriginal peoples on which the northern half of this continent was built, is older than Confederation and is worth keeping in whatever form that takes.

We have all heard the line by the poet Rilke, "Love consists in this, that two solitudes protect and touch and greet each other." But how much protection can Canadians expect from a government which gave us the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal and dismantled so many of our achievements? If we still want to build a civilized society which is a little fairer, safer and more tolerant than the American melting pot, we should say: "Why should we deny ourselves this adventure? We still want the new, confident Quebec as our ally in achieving these goals."

My second point is that you should tear up the myth that all provinces are the same. Again, let's start with a quick look at history. At the time of Confederation, Sir John A. Macdonald strongly believed that the common law provinces would unify their laws as to property and civil rights. As you may know, our Constitution does contain a provision that once Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia had made those laws uniform, the federal Parliament would take jurisdiction over property and civil rights in the common law provinces.

Quebec would have kept its own Civil Code. As you know, property and civil rights is a vast area. It covers everything from family law to car insurance, from labour law to securities law. And if that clause in the Constitution had been used as Sir John A. Macdonald expected, Quebec would have been a distinct society or would have had special status far beyond anything under discussion today. Quebec MPs would have been voting on Ontario's car insurance plan while Quebec had its own plan. Of course this never happened, but the point is the Fathers of Con-

federation were a lot more flexible than some constitutional lawyers are today.

No doubt your staff has given you all kinds of background on possible options. It is time to get some of these options out of the background and on to the table. For example, there is the option of legislative special status, which would not have scared Sir John A. at all.

But you are not limited to that. There is the option of provincial administration. We have had this for 124 years in criminal law. The criminal code is passed by Parliament, but the administration of criminal justice, the police and the prosecutors, is a provincial matter. That is how Dr Morgentaler's clinics were able to operate in Quebec before they were legalized elsewhere. If Quebec wants to administer some fields that are now in the federal government's hands, we could leave the rest of the country alone. Let Quebec have an administrative special status to pass laws relating to the administration of national policy in some fields. And of course, there is the well-known option of special administrative arrangements: the Canada pension plan and the Quebec pension plan.

1920

Another option, not yet widely discussed, is regulatory special status. Today, if the federal Parliament passes a statute, it normally provides that the federal cabinet shall pass regulations pursuant to that statute. Under regulatory special status, the regulations relating to Quebec would be passed by the Quebec cabinet, not the federal cabinet.

These options would not be many people's first choices, but although no one of them may be the whole answer, some combination of them might work. Ontario cannot afford not to try.

I am not here to discuss details, but to make my second basic point: Canadians want national standards on matters like medicare. We want to keep a strong central government, but we do not want Quebec to leave. We might find it simpler not to have any of these kinds of special status either, but if we have to choose between letting Quebec go and creating some imaginative compromise, please let's be creative.

ROD BRANDON

The Chair: I call next Rod Brandon.

Mr Brandon: This is my first attempt at anything like this, so I hope to keep it short and sweet. If I start to run on, somebody just holler.

I am Rod Brandon. I was born and raised and have always lived in Ontario. I am proud to be a Canadian. As president of the Employees' Association of Electronics, an independent, certified trade union representing 130 employees in the Peterborough area, I have experienced democracy in action for the past four years. The announcement of this new concept for this evening of inviting everyday Ontario citizens to express their views on their province and its role in Canada is the first sign of democracy I have seen from any level of government in my lifetime.

Because I am just an average citizen, I do not rely on reams of facts and figures that came from public opinion polls or royal commission reports, just a little common

sense. The following statement is hereby offered for consideration: The purpose of government is to represent the best interest of the majority of citizens as a whole.

It seems in the past our elected officials have disregarded this very basic principle in favour of economic and social status and almost every other personal gain imaginable, exemplified by the constant acknowledgement and negotiation with specific interest groups rather than the majority as a whole. Consider the amount of tax dollars utilized to perpetuate the need for government by continued negotiation with these special interest groups. These dollars could have been utilized to maintain a debt-free society which would have benefited the majority.

Despite the development and promotion of French-language education in Ontario schools, and the translation production and distribution of every public document in French as well as English, we can speak to and do business with company representatives around the world in English. However it is difficult and sometimes impossible to work in English 250 miles away, still in Canada.

We are free to drive the open road anywhere in our own country and rest assured that we can read and understand essential road signs, except for some places in Quebec. We can hang a sign outside the door of a business anywhere in Canada, in whatever language we want, to best serve our customers; that is not so in Quebec.

It goes on. We have several other situations where we have made special consideration for special interest groups. Originally we agreed to at least help out a little bit with a separate school or the separate school system. What do we have today? Two totally funded, individual administrations, ineffectively and inefficiently in parallel, attempting to achieve the same end, the segregation of neighbourhood children into separate social groups.

After years of attempting to satisfy pro-life and pro-choice activists with development of an abortion law, neither group has been satisfied with resulting legislation. In fact the legislation had to be scrapped, and that was the only thing that these two special interest groups could agree to.

After years of attempting to negotiate with native Canadians, which in my opinion is probably the only group that should have ever received any special consideration at all despite special tax, education and monetary considerations their reliance on social programs remains high, perhaps not their fault. There is continued unrest in the native Canadian community.

As a result of the implementation of social programs and policy to satisfy the rich special-interest groups, the poor citizens whose sole source of income is from social programs can maintain a higher standard of living than those working at minimum-wage jobs. Our community colleges are so geared to local business needs, the onus of providing continued skills training has been removed from the employer.

Average Canadians cannot support our economy through consumerism because of the increasing tax burden. There are three common characteristics which are present in the above examples. No special-interest group has ever been satisfied for long, negotiations have always continued and the burden on taxpayers has increased. At this point

we must ask ourselves what, if any, end—and I have a note to myself to put emphasis on the word “end,” because at this point in time it appears there never can be—can be achieved and what further negotiations and subsequent concessions to special-interest groups can be tolerated.

In these fast-paced, high-tech, free trade times, it is time for the new government of Ontario to focus attention on the best interests of the majority and to put an end to the continuous future-threatening concessions to fanatic special-interest groups. It is time for the new Ontario government to initiate the development of government policies which apply equally and fairly to all, yet allow minorities to pursue their individual interests at their own expense; to define the level of linguistic terrorism to be tolerated in Canada's future and for the province of Quebec to define its level of tolerance towards the majority of Canadians; to establish one efficient, publicly supported education system which serves the academic needs of all students; to develop legislation consistent with the needs and desires of the majority; to invite native Canadians to participate and prosper in Canadian society on an equal ground; to develop a taxation system which applies equally to all.

The ability to temporarily satisfy special-interest or lobby groups does not win votes. The respect gained by developing, administering and monitoring commonsense policies applied equally to all will provide an environment where the desire to be happy, successful and prosperous in all citizens will prevail and serve the best interests of the majority.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

MORRIS DALE GATES

The Chair: I invite next Morris Dale Gates.

Mr Gates: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee and ladies and gentlemen, fortunately for Canada, many Canadians today are seriously questioning the direction our political leaders have been and are leading us in. The public's lack of confidence has arisen for a good cause. Leadership failure has occurred in four main areas that I would like to address. You have asked me to cut my time, so I will skip three, the examples having to do with multiculturalism, with official bilingualism and with the economy, but I will go on and begin with what I call the leadership failure over the Constitution.

The Constitution has been manipulated to meet the vision of politicians and not the people. Patriation should never have proceeded in the face of Quebec's objections, but Trudeau cared not a whit for Quebec's strong feelings. The 1982 failure gave rise to Meech Lake and an even greater abuse of democracy. Abuse was paramount in the GST debate, yet we heard much talk of democracy. But politics is awash with hypocrisy.

Our elected representatives, the political leaders in our communities have also failed us, unintentionally perhaps, but that will continue until rigid party discipline ceases, and the mandate concept must also cease. The party élite set the political agenda, not the people or even the elected representatives. Very few MPs or MPPs take the big issues into their ridings for open discussion. The truth of the matter is the

people's participation is not wanted until a crisis occurs and then our support is sought—crisis democracy.

In future we want real democracy, where the people make the big decisions—capital punishment, abortion, deficit financing, immigration, Sunday shopping and others—as they arise. These issues must be decided by the people directly. Canadians have the education to make such decisions, and the required technology is available. Direct legislation, referendum and recall are now practical. Most important, direct legislation will ensure control of government always resides with the people. Never again should the people have to accept such leadership failure as we now have without the power, except a distant election, to end it.

1930

Politicians who speak against direct legislation employ weak arguments. Switzerland's stable society with its multiple languages and cultures amply demonstrates direct legislation's steadying influence. Yes, Canada needs a new Confederation. The majority refuses special status but Quebec demands it to the point of a separate state, if one accepts the Allaire report. The west and the Maritimes want a better power-sharing arrangement. The north and the aboriginal people want to govern themselves. At the individual level, most Canadians believe there is far too much government, that it is time to redistribute powers, to eliminate duplication and, most important, to return decision-making closer to the people themselves, right down to the municipal level when appropriate.

In other words, there is a form of support for the Allaire report, but not to the extent of destroying the total essence of Canada—Canadian citizenship—with no meaning whatsoever. A central government can remain strong, but only in those areas where the people wish it to be so. If Quebec's separation is to be discussed on the basis that all peoples have the right to self-determination, it must be on the basis of Quebec at the time of Confederation, without Rupert's Land, and the same right must be afforded to all political entities within Quebec, counties and townships.

Separation aside, a confederation of regions is perhaps the only basis for a new federalism. It is not a new idea—I am aware of that—but it is five semi-autonomous regions, namely, the west, Ontario, Quebec, the Maritimes and the northern region, that offer some hope of a better political balance while reducing government duplication.

In your discussion booklet you state that time is short. Why? Why is it short tonight? Why must we rush? Let us take the time to do it right, which means the agenda must ensure plenty of time for public reaction and input at every step of the way. In that same statement, it is also said, “It is too important to be left to the politicians alone.” Well, perhaps the politicians' role should end with these commissions. Our political leaders lack the public confidence needed for this difficult task. Canadians, once very trusting, are now openly resentful of their political leaders, fearful of a future control by them. A solution by today's leaders will be viewed with scepticism.

Given this almost total lack of confidence, drawing up a new agreement must be by a constituent assembly elected equally from all regions. In that way, the same

conditions would necessarily apply to all regions, with special status for none; otherwise there would be no agreement. Aboriginal issues and the Senate will necessarily be addressed fully. Finally, approval would be gained by a majority vote in all regions.

Poor political leadership has brought the country to a crisis condition, its existence threatened. There is common ground to remain one country through a redistribution of powers to five equal, semi-autonomous regions, confederation of regions. Describing a new Canada must not be left to the politicians, but given to a constituent assembly which must propose a new Confederation subject to, first, public scrutiny and discussion in every community in the land and, second, direct approval by a majority vote in all the regions. The time required to complete the task must be provided. There must be no pressure to complete the task within the mandate of any government.

The real need today is to renew democracy, to actively involve the people in decision-making, to give more equal voice to all parts of the country. Issues must be decided by consensus, majority rule, but an informed majority with consensus built from good information, more discussion and finally expressed openly as the people's voice. Our elected representatives must perform their leadership role in this context.

Thank you for the courtesy of your attention. I look forward to your report.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

PETER ADAMS

The Chair: I call next Peter Adams, who is a former MPP for this area.

Mr Adams: Mr Chairman, colleagues—former colleagues I should say—ladies and gentlemen, it is tragic that we should be debating the future of Canada at a time when our unique decentralized system of democracy is just coming into its own. Not long ago communications were such that it seemed impossible to govern a huge country with a diverse, scattered population such as the one we have. Today, modern means of travel and electronic means of communication have eliminated at least the technical problems of passing information from coast to coast to coast.

It seems that other parts of the world have begun to realize that we were on the right track. In Europe, as your discussion paper points out, through the European Community, overly centralized, sometimes dangerously nationalistic states are moving towards some sort of confederal system. In the USSR it would appear that they are struggling to move away from an overly centralized union towards something more decentralized to better cope with enormous regional differences.

One of the reasons I am particularly saddened that Confederation is at risk at this time is that ours is a system of government which has great potential for the ultimate solution of the great environmental problem we face. It could be a model for the world in this regard. Given the will, how would you design a system of government which can cope with such apparently diverse concepts as "small is beautiful" and "global village"?

The first makes a virtue of smallness and the second conveys the idea that all parts of the global system are inextricably linked and that environmental problems do not recognize political boundaries. These two famous concepts of the environmental movement are brought together in the equally famous axiom, "Think globally, act locally." Here in Canada, we have a system of government which has the potential to operationalize this guiding environmental principle.

For generations we have learned that Canada is the second-largest country in the world and thought little of it. Recently we have realized that we have the awesome responsibility for a huge and sensitive part of the Earth's surface, land, rivers, lakes and parts of three oceans, and responsibility for the air above that territory. We have a unique decentralized system of government which has the potential to act locally while also acting at as near a global scale as any nation can, while thinking globally.

What an irony, just as we have begun to recognize and accept our responsibilities for the global environment, that we should be considering dismantling Confederation, which provides us with a means of shouldering those responsibilities. Of course, these concepts which the environmental movement has adopted are simply bases for good government of any sort.

Socially, for example, "think globally and act locally" is the only way to go. Similarly, again as your discussion paper points out, the trend towards an increasingly globalized economic system is also towards small economic units like the prefectures of Japan and the cantons of Switzerland as the basis of that global economy. So I am sorry that we find ourselves engaged in such a bitter debate about the future of Canada just when it is becoming clear that our system of government has special strengths in allowing us to exercise stewardship over this particular piece of the global system and its people.

However, the debate is upon us, and debate we must. I tend to the view that further tinkering with Confederation will not provide a long-term answer, for such an approach will simply postpone the withdrawal of Quebec. The only solution which will allow Confederation as we know it to flourish is a renewal of shared national vision. I would like to think that our growing sense of responsibility for a huge piece of the globe, including the north, will help us find that vision.

But more immediately, I regret to say that I now feel that one of the more useful things this select committee can do at this particular time is to force the people of Ontario to start thinking about the unthinkable, if only as the last means of avoiding the unthinkable. The unthinkable of course is not Canada without Quebec; it is Canadas without Quebec. If we do not begin to think about these possibilities seriously, we may find that events overtaking us, and a bad situation may be made worse for lack of forethought. If we do begin to think about these possibilities seriously, we may well realize just how good what we have now is and what a fine base it provides for further, creative growth.

We have to think about the various possibilities for Canadas without Quebec in geographical, economic, social

and other terms and in terms of the allocation of powers that we might like to see in the new country which contains Ontario. I can imagine various scenarios which technically could be quite viable.

One of them is of course a country made up of all of modern Canada, less Quebec. Others involve smaller units, combinations of various provinces and territories. We would all do well to remember, though, some of the things which all of these possibilities have in common: None of them will be among the top 10 developed nations on the globe. None will have a market base greater than 18 millions. Each will be an even smaller mouse living alongside an elephant which will not have shrunk at all. In the part which contains Ontario at least, immigrants will make up a substantially larger proportion of the population than they do now, and I say that as an immigrant.

1940 Each of those possibilities will likely still be a small group of people trying to exercise stewardship over a huge piece of the globe, and each will be a brand-new, unproven country starting out with the disadvantage of the memory of a traumatic secession.

I believe that the people of Ontario are resourceful enough and energetic enough to make a go of a new country, whatever its political or geographical configurations. However, I also believe that they are coming to realize that they will be making a go of something which is second-best to a country developed from and soundly based on what we have now.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Adams.

JOHN HOLLINGSBURST

The Chair: I call next John Hollingshurst.

Mr Hollingshurst: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am one of the angry Canadian citizens. I am submitting a brief on what I believe to be one of the most divisive problems that we have in Ontario and indeed in the whole of the country.

Every single Canadian citizen has a duty and moral obligation to this country. The last 30 years have seen us inundated with unnecessarily large amounts of controversial pieces of legislation that have cascaded down upon our heads in such volume as to cause confusion and anger. We, the people, are the victims. We, the people, are being divided and abused by the very people and issues that should bind us together as a nation.

The solid foundations which this great nation was built on are being removed, the most controversial of which are the symbols of our nationalism: our flag, our language and our culture. We no longer have trust or even sympathy with any of our levels of government.

Every country has internal problems. Canada is no exception. The other day I heard a passionate cry from a member of a committee such as this: "I am fed up with French-bashing," etc. He was referring to bigots and racists. This cry and its counterpart, "Enough is enough," are cries from people in distress. The cries are proof that, one, the people are not being listened to and, two, the root of the problem lies in the political manoeuvring that has been

going on behind the scenes for years between the provinces and the federal government.

Here are a few excerpts from Ontario's French Language Services Act voting on 18 November 1986, translation of Hansard on the third reading of Bill 8. Ninety per cent of the reading of this bill was in the French language. This is in an English-speaking province. Seventy members absented themselves from the reading. Why? Less than half attended the most controversial and politically inspired piece of legislation that has gone through this House in years.

Mr Peterson—and we all remember him—said, "This is the largest leap in the past 120 years for the francophones of Ontario," 4.6% of the population of Ontario. He said, "We have much left to do, but now we are putting into practical effect the things we want to guarantee, real rights...giving a real opportunity to our Franco-Ontarians to live and work in their language." The target of this Ontario French Language Services Act is eventually official bilingualism entrenched in the Constitution.

I will refer you to Mr Rae, our present Premier. Mr Rae said, "I can remember...trying to get Ottawa to take that step...making Ontario a province where French is constitutionally entrenched in the Constitution of Canada and where French is recognized as an official language of our province."

Mr Rae further went on to say, "I want to go on record again today as saying to the Premier (Mr Peterson)...it is my personal view that Ontario can do an immense amount for national unity by taking that next step forward, a step that would include and recognize French as an official language in this province and one that would guarantee those rights in the Constitution."

So we have two premiers, one following the other, trying to make this province, an English-speaking province, an officially bilingual province.

The Chair: Sir, would you sum up, please.

Mr Hollingshurst: The cost, the reaction of this English-speaking province, the fairness in light of Quebec's language laws, were never given the slightest consideration.

I personally, like many more, have been vilified and branded as a bigot and a racist, whatever, because I had the temerity to stand up in defence of my country. I accept that as part of the price I must pay for daring to voice my convictions.

Quebec, if one dares to acknowledge the truth, never has been and never will be a willing partner in Confederation. For 232 years, generations of young Quebecers have been coerced into believing their rightful place is at the centre of a French-speaking Canada.

The Chair: Sir, I am going to have to ask you to end, please.

Mr Hollingshurst: What more proof—I have two minutes.

The Chair: No, you do not have two minutes, sir.

Mr Hollingshurst: Why not? You allowed other people to go further. I am angry and I think you should allow me to finish.

The Chair: Sir, you have gone beyond six minutes already. Would you please sum up.

Mr Hollingshurst: Beyond six minutes? Why can I not have 10 the same as Mr Adams and all the others?

The Chair: They did not have 10 minutes. I do not want to sit and—

Mr Hollingshurst: They did so. I timed them.

The Chair: Sir, they did not. I will allow you another minute to finish.

Mr Hollingshurst: Right. What more proof do I need to support my observations than to look at the extent to which provincial governments have gone to placate the French Quebec fears of assimilation? I will finish off on the last thing. I leave it to you to go back to Mr Rae and tell him that Ontario does not want to be made officially bilingual. Thank you.

1950

KEITH BOTTOMS

The Chair: I call next Keith Bottoms.

Mr Bottoms: Mr Chairman and members of the select committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to participate in these discussions. I have read your discussion paper but I do not feel qualified to comment on all the issues, and therefore I will briefly speak to the ones that are of most concern to me. I am going to speak briefly on constitutional changes, Quebec and official bilingualism, and what I think Ontario might do about these things.

But first, I believe that we need major changes in our Constitution in that it is not the case of fixing it any more. We must allow, I believe, regional control of the legislative process at the federal level. This could be done, I feel, via the triple E Senate proposal, which would allow the regions to have a full say in federal legislation through the Senate. This seems to be a very logical approach in consideration of the long, thin country that we have inhabited with such diversity of geography and climate. Ontario would, of course, lose some control in this situation, but I think it should be willing to do so in the interests of the whole nation.

A second change I would like to see would require free votes in the Houses of Parliament, both the Commons and the Senate. Now, this is assuming an elected Senate. Members would be free to vote their conscience or their constituents' wishes. Each bill would then far more likely be decided on its merits rather than on the wishes of a particular party or a particular party leader.

A third constitutional change I would like to see would be in the selection of our judges. I feel again regional interests should be paramount, with two judges being selected from each of the regions and a ninth one being selected by the Prime Minister. The regions I refer to are the main four regions: Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario and the west.

Fourth, I would like to see the Prime Minister elected directly or by a combined membership of the House of Commons and the Senate. This second option appeals to me because it would produce a welcome reduction in the Prime Minister's powers and make him or her responsible

to all the elected representatives of the people. I believe this would have a tremendous degree of legitimacy which would be hard to deny. The members of the Houses of Parliament would also, of course, be able to deselect him or her under certain conditions that would have to be carefully specified, but it would do away with dictatorial prime ministers.

On Quebec and official languages, I have asked, "What can we do in English-speaking Canada to keep Quebec a part of the country?" Or do we want it to remain a part of Canada? Perhaps instead it could become the friendly nation next door. I sometimes feel that in trying to solve the Quebec problem, we are trying to reconcile the irreconcilable.

Some years ago after reading René Lévesque's book *My Quebec*, I said to my wife upon setting the book down "Quebec is going to separate some day." I said this because Lévesque's thoughts and feelings left me with the very strong belief that what Quebec wants, we cannot give at least not while maintaining our strong belief in democratic principles.

This "distinct society" clause that Quebec wanted in our Constitution I thought and many people thought was very objectionable because it permanently divides Canada into two groups: French Canadians on the one hand and everyone else on the other. This, I believe, is no way to unify a country. I think the question for many Canadians was and is: "How far can we stretch democratic principles and still call ourselves a democratic nation? How far can we go in appeasing Quebec's ever-increasing demands and still have more than a shell of a country left?" I think the answer was given at the Meech Lake defeat, when English speaking Canadians massively supported Elijah Harper and Premier Wells in saying, "This time perhaps you've gone too far."

What can Ontario do? First, I think Quebec should be accepted as a French-speaking province without having to use a "notwithstanding" clause. Without official bilingualism which neither Quebec nor the rest of Canada wants, the provinces could speak and use the language or languages of their choice. Quebec would be free to call itself a distinct society and use a language of its choice.

Second, Ontario should rethink official bilingualism. This is an idea which I do not think has worked. It is time to accept this and try something else. Most people in English-speaking Canada have almost no need to learn French, and a bigger problem is very little opportunity to use it in any case. The reason for this is that only one person in 20, or eight of 10 provinces, speaks French.

The Chair: Sir, I am going to ask you to sum up.

Mr Bottoms: Okay. I was going to mention that I thought Ontario should make a strong effort to be more co-operative and more westward-looking and to join with the four western provinces. I also think Ontario must encourage all of the people of Canada to call themselves Canadian, unhyphenated, and to celebrate occasions and historical events which have meaning to the Canadian experience. Let us stop emphasizing our differences and start emphasizing our common values, our common principles, and our common experiences.

Finally, major constitutional change is going to occur in Canada whether we want it or not. Things have progressed too far to call a stop at this juncture. Things cannot remain as they are. They cannot remain the same. We must not, however, be distressed by this turn of events but rather seize the opportunity to rewrite the fundamental law of the land. We must look upon this situation as an opportunity to do it right this time. It must, however, be done in a way that illustrates our strong belief and democratic equality, that encourages our separate identity and that supports our commitment to social services in a caring, free and democratic Canada. I thank you for your attention.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

GREGORY WOOD

The Chair: I call next Gregory Wood.

Mr Wood: Mr Chairman, members of the provincial Parliament, I too would like to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you tonight. I would particularly like to express appreciation for your stamina. You must be worn out by now. Before getting into the substance of my remarks, it might be helpful to you if I situate them.

I was born, raised and received my formal education in Alberta. I speak fluent French and my work takes me very frequently to Quebec, where I have numerous friends, acquaintances and business associates. I appreciate the Quebec culture and feel at home there. In the past, my work took me regularly to the east coast, and I visited all of the Atlantic provinces on a number of occasions. Although I would be quite comfortable living in any region of Canada, I have chosen Ontario.

J'ai commencé à apprendre le français à l'âge de 23 ans. Aujourd'hui, je serais tout à fait à l'aise vivant, travaillant et menant ma vie sociale en français au Québec, même dans un Québec indépendant. Mais en dépit de mes efforts à apprendre le français, et ceux de milliers d'autres anglophones, les efforts de centaines de milliers de francophones à apprendre l'anglais, il faut maintenant que nous fassions face avec réalisme à un Canada plus divisé que jamais.

I am here today because I fear that our current crisis could well end in tragedy. By this, I mean not only the breakup of Canada but also accompanying economic and social disarray. If such a tragedy is to be averted, or at least mitigated, we must begin by articulating, clearly and usefully, the problem and critical parameters. Only then can a coherent strategy be developed and the practical handling of the crisis be adept.

From the snatches of your hearings, which I have been able to see on television, I have been particularly concerned by a general inability or unwillingness to examine the basic problems in a dispassionate manner. With this in mind, I have chosen a few points which I would like to address, in the hope that they will contribute to injecting more coherence and realism into the debate.

2000

We must recognize first that, although the values and aspirations of Ontarians are important, dissatisfaction with Confederation has its roots in Quebec and in other regions of Canada. Our views on Confederation must be tailored to

deal with dissatisfaction. Moreover, it is important to differentiate between the dissatisfaction of the regions and that of Quebec. Dissatisfaction in the regions has different roots and a different character than that in Quebec and demands a different and separate response.

Let's first consider Quebec. It is critical to understand the basis of Quebec's dissatisfaction of Canada. It might be helpful to view the Quebec situation in terms of Quebecers' evident primary allegiance to Quebec rather than to Canada. This is not to say that Quebecers feel no attachment to Canada. As many of us who are in close touch with Quebec have long recognized, Quebec's unique aspirations stem largely from this basic sentiment.

It is therefore critical that Ontario and Canada admit openly this reality and accept it without recrimination, because so many Ontarians have had such difficulty with this important element as is demonstrated each time the unfortunate reference is made to being Canadian first. I would like to dwell on it a minute. I will resort to a couple of simple analogies which I hope will be useful.

Try to imagine, for instance, what your position might be if Ontario were, by historical arrangement or outdated military defeat, part of Mexico. Regardless of how benevolent was the Spanish-speaking majority, you might well be somewhat uncomfortable knowing that the Mexican majority would always dominate national decision-making. It is possible that you would resent having to speak Spanish to have a successful career in government or that you would tend to view the rest of Mexico as a whole and not be sufficiently concerned with regional differences between Tijuana and Vera Cruz. Perhaps you might even have aspirations of forming an independent Ontario.

From another angle, if these same people who are apparently unable or unwilling to accept or understand Quebecers' allegiance to Quebec are asked if they wish to be American, they reply with a resounding no. This is not because they do not like Americans or because they perceive that Americans do not like them. They would readily admit that no number of youth exchanges or noble expressions of brotherhood or sisterhood from our American friends would change their minds. Yet many of you do not understand why this approach will not work with Quebecers. And let us remember that our culture is, in many ways, more similar to the United States than Quebec's is to ours. At least we speak the same language.

For providing some views on how we might approach the Quebec problem, let me turn for a minute to the rest of Canada, which is a very different situation. From my experience, the overwhelming majority of anglophone Canadians throughout the country feel a primary allegiance to Canada. Their discouragement stems from a long-standing feeling of impotence and disregard, which Canada, in its inimical manner, has failed to address for far too long.

They now favour decentralization largely because they have given up hope for what they perceive as fair and equitable treatment under the current federal system. Many could accept and even support a relatively strong central government, if convinced that their interests would be looked after. The dissatisfaction of the regions, particularly the west, must be dealt with if Canada is to flourish in

harmony in the long term. Moreover, westerners in particular will be watching closely the process dealing with the current crisis, and they will expect their interests to be taken appropriately into account. If the west's views are once again ignored, this will provide a powerful impetus to those in that region contemplating a future outside Canada.

Now, let me turn back to how we might deal with Quebec. As implied earlier, little can be done to alter Quebecers' primary allegiance to Quebec. Emotional appeals will not allay their desire for independence. With regard to constitutional change, it is time to put to bed the myth that Quebec's principle objective is to protect or promote its language and culture. Quebecers and all others were informed of what has happened in Quebec over the last 25 years. Know that Quebec now has all the tools necessary to protect these interests. Those of you who have read the Allaire report may have noted that not once does the document even mention the protection of language and culture within Quebec.

The Chair: Mr Wood, you are going to have to sum up.

Mr Wood: Okay. In summing up, I would like to address the most important question that your committee will consider, which is, "Should Quebec be given a special arrangement within Confederation?" Like many of you perhaps, I would be tempted to respond positively, in the vague hope that this might keep Canada together. At the very least, it just might buy time for a leader to arise to turn the tide in Quebec. But there is a fundamental problem with such a position, one that cannot be ignored in the democratic society in which we live. The committee must face the fact that the majority of Ontarians and other anglophone Canadians reject this outright.

This is not to suggest that this vast majority of Canadians are intolerant or even that they reject the notion that Quebec is a distinct society. But there can be no doubt that they have a deep and abiding conviction that all Canadians will be equal and, right or wrong, they are not about to be convinced otherwise.

I do not necessarily agree with much of this sentiment. I have no doubt that there will be hell to pay, particularly in western Canada but also in Ontario, if this conviction is not given due respect. With this in mind, I would like to make a final comment on the work of your committee.

Surely your committee is playing a useful role in focusing public attention and generating thought on critical and urgent matters facing our province and nation. As you draft your report, I would ask that you guard against the temptation of using these hearings as a pretext for putting forward recommendations that do not accurately reflect the views of the majority of Canadians, of Ontarians. Although I personally believe in bilingualism reform, a report which reflects only my views or, I expect, your views could well result in great bitterness and in the end cause more difficulties than it would resolve. You must set for yourself the daunting task of articulating a position which is able to form a broad consensus of the majority, so often absent from the many recent governmental decisions. I wish you every success in your endeavours.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ROBERT BOWLEY

The Chair: I invite next Robert Bowley.

Mr Bowley: Danke, grazie, merci, domo, thank you. In French Polynesia I would start this by saying, "I greet you." In Britain's tiniest colony I would start by saying, "I hope you are well." I am bilingual in English and chemistry, which was my working language.

I have agonized over what to say in a few minutes, there is so much. I have given you a longer written version which I hope you will read. I have asked myself many questions about our many problems and have tried to find constructive answers.

It seems that most of our population is fed up with party politics. My answer is to have a complete reform, a switch to the presidium style of government at the federal and provincial levels, like the ward system in many municipalities. These elected members would sign a contract of allegiance to Canada and to the aspirations of their constituents and the contract would have an impeachment clause in it.

I would reduce the number of federal members from over 260 to 110. I would make the Yukon and the Northwest Territories provinces at once, and distribute the seats using a population-and-area formula. This would, using the Manitoba and Ontario border as the geographical centre of Canada, give the west 50 and the east 60. Ontario and Quebec would have only 14 each, getting rid of the overpowering current voting strength of these two. The same principles should be used at the provincial level as well.

2010

We appear to have a serious problem with Quebec, with the words "separate" and "sovereignty" being bandied about. A brief review of history reveals that the land on which a great many Canadians of French ancestry now live was ceded to Britain in 1763. The French people were allowed at that time to stay on this land and, in the terms of the Treaty of Paris, allowed to retain their cultural habits, their language and their religion in their daily personal lives.

In 1867 they ceased to be French. They have since been just Canadians. Check your passport. There is no such thing as a French Canadian or a Vietnamese Canadian. New citizenship papers identify immigrants as just Canadian citizens. This divisive use of prefixing should be abolished. Those of French ancestry are still allowed to live on the land called Quebec, but the land belongs to the Dominion of Canada.

It is a shame that when the Parti québécois was started and its leaders began to incite separatism, the perpetrators of this sedition were not charged and expelled from Canada. There is no mechanism in the BNA Act for the separation of a piece of land from the Dominion, nor is there presently such a mechanism in the Constitution of 1982. According to Professor David Hogg in his 1985 book, *Constitutional Law of Canada*, the only way land could be separated is by revolution.

The BNA Act makes us all Canadians, all equal. No one ethnic group can be distinct or, using one common synonym for this word, superior—it is no wonder that so

any of us were upset when that was introduced—and no province should have any sovereignty or supreme power over its residents that other provinces do not have, or if we are going to have any unity in the country.

Party-type politicians at the provincial level in Quebec and Ontario and at the federal level are responsible for this mess. Every time the Quebec gang demanded and gained an inch, they went for a mile. Our weak and ethnically based federal gang have made a habit of handing it over. Ontario has followed suit for unknown reasons. The latest travesty is the immigration agreement signed on 6 February giving Quebec supreme power to select francophone immigrants. This divisive legislation must be repealed.

Since the federal government decides on many issues and aspects of the lives of all Canadians, and I think it should, and since the common language of most of them is English, I would repeal the Official Languages Act, which has put a terrible burden in many ways on a very large majority of Canadians since 1969. I would replace it with a simple language act whereby the federal government and all its ministries from coast to coast would operate using English only, especially in the House of Commons. This would satisfy over 90% of all Canadians who use the common language English in their daily interactions with other Canadians.

There would be a proviso that any municipality, township, county or even province where a healthy majority, like 70%, of the residents ask for it could use any additional language, provided it raised local taxes to pay for the cost of the bilingual service.

The Chair: Sir, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Bowley: My advice to members of any ethnic group which finds that it cannot live in harmony in this Dominion as it is presently constituted with members of all other ethnic groups on a completely equal basis should separate by the only lawful means at their disposal—emigration. I hope it will be clarified in a new Constitution that all immigrants from all corners of the Earth, along with all present Canadian citizens, including our first nations people, are welcome in all provinces where they can retain their own cultural habits in their own homes, small business and churches, while living together amicably under one common Canadian flag, using one set of laws, having a fair taxation system, like income tax only, and being governed by a group of elected representatives at all levels of government whose sole purpose in life is to do the best they possibly can for their constituents while making sure that we have a strong, unified Canada.

DEAN WASSON

The Chair: Dean Wasson.

Mr Wasson: Members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, good evening, bon soir. I would like first of all to present to you my thoughts in summary because I understand that I do not have that much time this evening. Is it correct I have somewhere around seven minutes?

The Chair: You have somewhere around five minutes.

Mr Wasson: Five minutes. Everyone else, after sum-up, has been running seven minutes.

The Chair: Well, I will give you the warning at five minutes, which usually means about six minutes, okay?

Mr Wasson: Thank you very much. It is my opinion that we are searching for common ground in the area of culture and language. Because of the French-English nature in Canada, it most likely will be regionally based and it must be sensitive to the views of the majority as well as the minority within the regions. There needs to be regional sensitivity in fiscal and economic policies. The Charter of Rights must be flexible enough to allow cultural divergence by region. We need to create and sustain a level playing field for the minorities in the area of language, education, employment and government services. Native issues need to be addressed. In my brief I have written material on that which I have left with you and I probably will not have time to get to it. We need less government, and that has been adequately covered in your hearings to date, so I will not be covering that any further.

The searching for a common ground is directed at a new Canada, with Quebec as a fully participating partner. In the event that Quebec cannot be satisfied with reasonable reshaping of Canada, then we must decide who will negotiate with Quebec on de-Confederation. We should not be prepared to negotiate with a knife at our throat, with a Quebec-stated position only for consideration. We should move quickly to set out English Canada's basic position for de-Confederation. In my view, Ontario should lead that initiative. With that position clearly in mind, the Quebec people will be in a position to make a reasoned decision on opting for a united Canada or separation. Finally, a new direction for Canada must be approved by the people in a referendum.

Let me now go on to the question of what we have in common as symbols or a common identity across Canada. Great emphasis is currently being placed on multiculturalism and bilingualism as the key to our Canadian identity. On the contrary, what this symbolizes is a country that is totally focused on its minorities. The traditions, culture and values of the majority will be and, in the opinion of many, have been sacrificed to that end. What it is doing, in many people's view, is emphasizing diversity and thereby disunity. I sense this view in both English-speaking Canada and French-speaking Canada, and it is also echoed in the ethnic community.

It seems to me that we need to seriously rethink the situation. We need to find a way to provide services to the minorities in whatever language without the official bilingual emphasis. In my view, Ontario should lead the way by redrafting Bill 8 as a bill for services to all minorities wherever numbers warrant. In the main, this should be accomplished through coupling Bill 8 with the thrust of employment equity legislation.

We should then move on to defining national symbols and beliefs which we all will support. We should first develop a vision for Canada along idealistic lines in which we would continue to emphasize our commitment to equality of opportunity and the acceptance of everyone as an equal.

2020

As a principle, what I really want is for me to live in my community in peace and harmony with those about me so that they do not feel threatened by me, nor do I feel threatened by them. I would also like my heritage recognized and protected in our culture and national symbols and to not have them continually eroded, as the courts redefine our society in the light of the Charter of Rights.

In that spirit, let me express my sense of a common heritage. I am going to try to paraphrase here, so pardon some of the slipup. But to do that, I am going to use as an example my family, which came to this community in 1831. We are thousands in the community and we are thousands, and maybe tens of thousands, across Canada as we have proliferated. You know, they were ordinary Canadians and by all the standards of historians they were non entities. They did not command armies, they took little part in history-making decisions and they shunned the limelight. None of them would be up here speaking tonight. A few of them achieved—

The Chair: Could you sum up, sir.

Mr Wasson: All right. What they did, in my view, was more important than many acts of statesmanship. What they really did is build Canada, and that is where I focus my pride in my heritage, as a builder of Canada. I sense, as I work through this land, and I travel quite frequently across the land, that is where a lot of people focus their pride. It is their pride in having built a strong and proud nation. I think if we come to grips with that and focus on that as the common theme across Canada, we might be able to do something in terms of engendering a spirit of national unity. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

JOHN CHRISTMAS

The Chair: Next is John Christmas.

Mr Christmas: Thank you for letting me share my thoughts with you. It seems to me that we have had this constitutional crisis as an ongoing thing and I really see no satisfactory end to it. Quebec now has so many powers that in fact it is essentially a separate country, for example, when it has the powers over immigration, but a person then coming into Quebec can go anywhere in the country. If you say, "No, you cannot do that," then you have a separate country.

My feeling is, whether we like it or not, Quebec is going to separate, and I am mostly concerned that we should be prepared for that, because it looks as though 1992 could be upon us. My own feeling is that the separation of Quebec is not really a serious problem in the country. However, the conditions of separation must be thought about right now, and the most serious aspect in my opinion is the geographical one. We must not allow the Atlantic region to be cut off geographically from central Canada. This is reminiscent of West Berlin and the split-up of Pakistan into east and west Pakistan when the British left India and it leads to a lot of trouble.

My feeling is that whatever Quebec decides to do, the land immediately west of Montreal, the mainly English

Eastern Townships, the south shore of the St Lawrence, including the Gaspé, should remain a part of Canada regardless. The northern and northwestern part of Quebec, which was formerly Rupert's Land and was ceded to Britain not Quebec, together with Newfoundland and Acadia, by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 and later became part of the Northwest Territories, was only transferred to Quebec I believe for convenience of administration. I feel the native inhabitants of this region should be allowed to decide their own future, with Quebec or with Canada, by a referendum under United Nations supervision.

The state of Quebec should print its own currency, entirely independent of the Canadian dollar. Immigration into Canada from Quebec would be handled in the same way as immigration from anywhere else. Trade with Quebec would be by negotiated agreements, the same as applies to the United States or other countries. Quebec should also assume its proportionate share of the national debt.

My feeling is that once Quebec is separate, relations will be much better between Canada and Quebec than they are now.

Ontario should support the creation of three new provinces. These would be the Yukon, the western part of the present Northwest Territories and the eastern part of the Northwest Territories, the last of these to include that part of present-day Quebec which was formerly Rupert's Land, should the native inhabitants wish it.

The federal government: I would keep the House of Commons much the same as it is now, except that all candidates for Parliament be required to pass an intelligence test. The test would include questions in logic, ethics, geography and accounting. The Senate should be abolished in its present form and be replaced by a triple E Senate, with equal representation from each of the 12 provinces. This is designed to give the west, the Maritimes, Newfoundland, and the northern natives better representation in government.

The Constitution: The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is a typical French-style, top-down Constitution, in which rights are doled out by bureaucrats to those below them. It divides the country into groups, each with its rights. It results in much litigation, which adds nothing to the wealth of the country, and increases resentment between groups and individuals. It also transfers large amounts of money from government into the pockets of lawyers. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms could be abolished. In its place would be the laws of Canada.

The Chair: Sir, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Christmas: These laws should be: (1) sensible and clearly stated; (2) arrived at by a consensus of the people; (3) enforced by punishment sufficient to deter the crime—and I do not mean rehabilitation; and (4) taught in schools. Provided the laws are not broken, people should be free to do anything they want.

The judiciary should operate within provincial or national guidelines so that sentences have less of the character of a lottery. The present Constitution moves much of the responsibility for decision-making away from our elected officials and gives it to appointed judges in various

courts. This is extremely undemocratic. Consequently judges are making decisions on subjects such as the environment, on which they have little, if any, knowledge. More responsibility should reside in Parliament, where members are made accountable to the voters.

I do have one or two things to say about finance—

The Chair: Sorry, we do not have time—

Mr Christmas: Can I just say one thing?

The Chair: Very, very briefly.

Mr Christmas: The national debt stands at \$380 billion, double the per capita debt of the United States. How was his money spent? Well, we sure have not put a man on the moon. Much of the money has been spent in an attempt to buy Quebec into staying in Confederation. Between the years 1980 and 1988, the federal government transferred to Quebec \$95 billion more than it received from Quebec in taxes. This alone amounts to one quarter of the national debt, but does not include the interest on the money since that time or capital expenditures done in Quebec.

The Chair: Sir, I am going to have to stop you there. I am sorry. Thank you.

2030

ERIC DAVIS

The Chair: I call Eric Davis. Come forward, sir. I think you were not here when I announced that we are working on five-minute time lines.

Mr Davis: Well, I am going to have to read like a newscaster.

The Chair: Do not try to speed up, because that is just going to confuse everybody. Just summarize as best you can.

Mr Davis: Thank you for the opportunity to appear here tonight. I wish to comment on constitutional reform and democratic government. Other speakers have already spoken about the American system of government and its superiority over those of other countries in delivering effective representative democracy. If Canada is one of the most democratic in the world, it is not because of its Constitution, but despite its inadequacies. If we can improve our Constitution, we may set an example for other countries to follow in the next decade or two of political ferment and reform. If we could but do that, it would benefit developing countries by more than billions of dollars in foreign aid.

The American Constitution was devised with the benefit of recognizing the defects of the British parliamentary system. The original Constitution was framed with the idea of government by consensus. Tyranny was to be avoided by splitting the powers of the federal government three ways. Laws were to be made only by the agreement of both Houses of Congress. The administration of the laws was to be the responsibility of an elected president, assisted by his cabinet of appointed secretaries with departmental responsibilities. An independent judicial system headed by the Supreme Court rules on matters of law and the constitutional validity of new laws.

In the first Congress assembled in 1780, there were no political parties. Indeed, George Washington believed

political parties to be a threat to democracy. However, the experience over the next 20 years brought about a change of view, and a constitutional amendment provided for the creation and representation of two political parties. In a two-party system the winner always has a majority of the votes. Furthermore, the elected representative is expected to speak in the Congress in favour of the interest of his constituency. Party loyalty is secondary to constituency interest.

In British parliamentary practice, the situation is much different. In Canada, we had enormous power concentrated in the hands of the Prime Minister. Theoretically, both in Britain and in Canada, the government is the inner cabinet. The recent ouster of Prime Minister Thatcher is the result of her authoritarian exercise of her prime ministerial powers. She ignored the advice of her ministers and acted on the advice of unelected advisers. Democracy had fallen prey to autocracy or quasi-dictatorship. I must say she did a great deal of good for her country and her intentions were good. It was only a provision in the constitution of the Conservative Party that allowed her to be removed as party leader.

Another defect in our system is that where there are three or more parties contending for election, there is a good chance that the winning party can rule with a majority of seats but with less than the majority of votes. For example, in the last federal election the PCs won 169 seats out of a total of 295, an absolute majority of 43 seats over both opposition parties. This large majority was won with only 43% of the valid votes passed, with the opposition parties together winning 52%. It is a poor reflection on our democracy when the PC cabinet can rule the country as it wishes while representing a minority of the voters.

Some people argue in favour of proportional representation as a remedy for this problem. But proportional representation as practised by the Italians leads to a great proliferation of small parties. Governments can only be formed by coalitions which are unstable and may last less than a year before there is a reshuffling.

I have a proposal to put forward which would go a long way towards solving this problem and improve greatly the prospects for consensus government. The proposal is that we halve the number of constituencies by twinning adjacent ones and to have two representatives for each enlarged constituency. In other words, the two candidates for the largest and second-largest number of votes would be elected to Parliament.

I have made a preliminary study of the impact of such a system upon the electoral results in the recent Ontario election. The following figures indicate the difference in the results. The actual results were that the NDP with 37.6% of the votes had 74 seats. They needed 63 seats, something like that, for a majority. With the proposed system, the NDP would have had 60 seats and 45.84% of the vote. The other parties would have increased the number of seats and the results would have been a minority government for the NDP. The average number of votes per seat did not vary greatly. My results show the following: NDP 23,484; Liberals 20,772; Progressive Conservatives 21,221. With averages as close as this, it hardly seems worth while to go to the trouble of weighting each

member's voting power in the Legislative Assembly according to the number of votes received at the election.

The Chair: You are going to have to sum up, sir.

Mr Davis: I also propose that the Senate as currently constituted is archaic, irrelevant and should be abolished. It should be replaced by a new House of the Provinces whose principal job would be to look after constitutional matters and to set out rules by which government should govern. It should not take part in the affairs of the government of the day, it should not have any votes, but it should set down the rules which should be followed by the government and by political parties. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

PETERBOROUGH NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY
RIDING ASSOCIATION

The Chair: I call next Gareth Park.

Mr Park: Thank you, Mr Chair. I am probably slightly different. I am presenting this on behalf of the Peterborough New Democratic Party Riding Association. Peterborough New Democrats had a small group meeting and sat around and brainstormed about the concerns we had with the present Constitution and the debate surrounding the Constitution. Like all Canadians, we were not unanimous on all areas, but we did have a number of concerns and a number of recommendations we wanted to bring forward.

We would like to affirm Canada as a good place to live. We have enjoyed its inclusion of diversity, its social programs, its potential for political, economic, social and environmental justice for all Canadians. Peterborough New Democrats feel the whole is stronger than the parts, and we are glad to be Canadians.

New Democrats also have concerns with the way the Constitution and the debate around it has been proceeding in this country. The continuing exclusion of aboriginal people from Canadian life represents a major failure, and I might add that any constitutional re-evaluation will not succeed unless it resolves the deplorable state of our nation's first and original peoples. The hurt that results from the political exclusion of women, native people, the poor, the disabled, gay men and lesbians, ethnic and minority groups and the French is an obstacle to a creative future for this country.

A business, not a people's, economic agenda actively fostered by government has added to that hurt and has created further divisions among people. It has put in peril many lives within the groups listed above, through poverty, violence and instability. The sellout of our natural resources and the use of them solely for profit, not sustainability, have led to a lack of self-sufficiency and severe environmental degradation in a potentially rich country.

The danger of the separation of Quebec is a product of divisive leadership and of the lack of understanding of history, and may result in the balkanization of Canada. Peterborough New Democrats are concerned about the vagueness of current Ontario and federal constitutional consultations with the public. It appears to be designed to leave the politicians space to bargain in the back room again, without taking seriously the options of the people of Canada.

A draft statement from both levels of government expressing their constitutional aims would give people responding some idea of the federal and provincial agendas of what will be discussed in the back rooms. This would provide a focus for agreement or change in the public and be a more serious attempt at consultation. The process by which we proceed in amending a Constitution and discussing it will in many respects determine the outcome.

The failure of leadership provincially, but particularly in the federal sphere, has played a major role in creating the serious concerns listed above. New Democrats, along with a major percentage of the general public, believe that efforts at short-term political gain have actively created division and competition at a historic moment when there is no room for winners or losers. Dialogue has been constructed in terms of competing interests, and we have seen that tonight. Peterborough New Democrats would like to recommend the following for inclusion in a new Constitution.

2040

The select committee and all levels of government must think and act, in terms of thinking about aboriginal people, as original and sovereign people on a level with both the English-and the French-speaking peoples. This principle must be included in the new Constitution.

The federal government must be given the responsibility to ensure fundamental principles of balance among the interests of the people, the environment and the economy. Balanced development of these three spheres will ensure a fair and just Canada. This calls for a new set of relations within Confederation entrusted to the federal government and enshrined in the Constitution. The social, political and economic rights of all Canadians must be protected by a strong federal government. The environment, whose health affects the future of Canada, must be recognized and protected as a valued part of all our decision-making. The economy must serve people, not devalue them. Economic self-sufficiency and self-sustainability for Canada must be the fundamental priorities of the federal government under the new Constitution.

The hurt suffered through exclusion from political and economic life by women, aboriginal people, francophones, ethnic and other minorities must be acknowledged. Inclusion of their voices and interests in the new Canadian Constitution must be guaranteed.

The new Constitution must be concerned with how diversity can be accommodated in an inclusive way, not an exclusive way. It must reflect common values of inclusion and equality. Canada's democratic processes must extend the concept of political democracy to include economic, social and environmental rights for all Canadians. These must be based in the Constitution and maintained through powers designated to the federal government to ensure that regional differences never threaten these basic rights.

The Constitution should include ways to achieve an ongoing process of political empowerment for all Canadians, not just in times of crisis; a process of continuing meaningful consultation around major social, economic, environmental and constitutional issues. The select committee should examine models which give the wider population a chance to discuss and examine these issues, and I want to

emphasize that we are not just talking narrow constitutional issues but broader public issues, a lot of which has spilled into the presentations tonight and which determine how we think about this country.

The Chair: Mr Park, would you sum up, please.

Mr Park: These models should range from formal dialogue to informal discussions at the grass-roots level. We request that upcoming consultations between the federal government and the provinces be based on positive and inclusive language, rather than who gets what and who loses what.

Peterborough New Democrats urge the politicians of our province and our country to redefine leadership, to ensure that the above suggestions be included in the Constitution and practised after its creation.

Finally, I would like to ask the select committee to identify in its report who was present at these hearings and who was not. Many voices in this community and province cannot participate publicly for a variety of reasons: poverty, homelessness, threat of violence, illiteracy or lack of education. Alternative approaches to these people must be found so that no group or individual is voiceless. Thank you.

JIM ROBINSON

The Chair: I call next Jim Robinson.

Mr Robinson: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have just received a news flash. The war is over. The battle of the Plains of Abraham was won by General Wolfe, so what are we here for?

What I have been listening to this evening is characteristic of what I was afraid I was going to be listening to, but I came out anyway. My name is Jim Robinson. I am a small businessman who has lived in Ontario, with a five-year sabbatical in the United States, since 1964.

My parents were English—read British, if you like—and I was born in London, Ontario. We moved to Drummondville, Quebec when I was six years old. My schooling was in English. I was not assassinated by French Canadians while I was there—I am here now—and I graduated from high school in English. I attended the provincial textile institute in Ste Hyacinthe, Quebec, where courses were in both languages. Je parle français aussi.

After graduation I worked in the textile industry in Drummondville and Granby, Quebec. French was the major language for communication. Peterborough became home in 1964, where I worked at a local industry. I was often called to translate when calls came from Quebec customers.

I am in favour of French immersion, if for no other reason than that it promotes understanding. How is English immersion in Quebec doing? Subtitles are less interesting and offer only a smattering of what is going on. I sympathize with Ontarians when they tell of the trip they made to Quebec and how someone could or would not serve them in English. Is it possible a Québécois has experienced a similar difficulty in Ontario? Trampling the Quebec flag and telling someone to "speak white" may make newspaper headlines, but it is not indicative of the general feeling of Ontarians towards French-speaking Quebecers, at least I do not believe so. Vive la différence. It sells newspapers.

There are things that annoy me about Quebec: "Je me souviens." I remember. "Je me souviens de quoi?" What do I remember? "Maîtres chez nous." Masters in our own house; street name changes to rewrite history, Lévesque for Dorchester; Bill 101; multiculturalism, Quebec style. One thing I read just recently was "discourage ethnic immigration to Montreal to avoid buildup of ethnic minorities who might opt for speaking English." How ridiculous can you get?

If we believe that a nation benefits by a non-discriminatory immigration policy, should one province be allowed to select its immigrants? I am sure we could avoid problems in integrating immigrants if we selected ones that spoke either official language, but more simply English for Ontario. Why not? Hyphenated Canadians do not a nation make. Personally, when I am asked, I say I am Canadian.

Quebec should be reminded it is one of ten provinces; distinct, yes, but one of ten. Hitler's attempt to create a master race by selective breeding? How boring. And Greek street signs on the Danforth threatening to our very existence? We are poorer for the experience if the thought police are allowed to take over. Anybody here attended Expo 67? What a wonderful, exhilarating experience. What happened?

Official bilingualism has created more problems than it is worth. You cannot legislate language where people have no occasion to use it, and I speak as somebody who speaks both languages.

How do we persuade Quebecers that we appreciate their desire to retain their identity but we see no reason to give up ours? Quebec is important to the Canadian identity both economically and culturally. Contributions are significant. Look at Highway 401 some day. Traffic goes both ways. We should appreciate what they have to offer and vice versa.

What can we do to improve the situation? Try a dose of understanding. Marcel Masse's \$45 million, which I understand is being eliminated, but to study culture in Montreal? How ridiculous. That would have been better spent on student exchanges, not only between Quebec and Ontario but with other provinces. Grass-roots groups work a lot better. They are a lot more successful than politicians at national conferences. A look at the past and current peccadilloes of some of our premiers substantiate my reasoning.

Backroom negotiations suit contract talks. They sure as heck do not do anything for constitutional ones. At least the union members get a chance to vote on the results. How do we emphasize our desire to improve relations and let the Québécois know we care? Well, we have an idea from the Americans. We will tie a yellow ribbon on the old oak tree and say: "Please stay on. We need each other." Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

2050

CLIFF SPICER

The Chair: Next is Cliff Spicer.

Mr Spicer: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am not Keith's relative. This is a result of our Kairos meeting, which is a study group that we run in Peterborough. You have copies of it. We are responding directly to your questions.

The values we share as Canadians: We felt these were multiculturalism, opportunity, geography and climate. We feel that Canadians are multicultural, which means tolerant, and we are proud of it. But we are emphasizing differences too much.

Securing our future in the international economy: We feel it requires superior education, especially in technical and scientific areas. We feel some sort of sense of community is needed along with a sense of how to "price ourselves down" in order to become more creative and competitive in all fields, including farming.

The federal and provincial governments: We feel all levels of government do not listen enough to specific needs. Overlaps should be reduced. Decisions should be shared and not forced. Voters should have more opportunities to decide. For example, was the Bill of Rights necessary?

Achieving justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples: Provide them with more flexibility and more choices. Listen to the Indians' needs and attempt resolutions. Encourage self-government. Get solutions from the local groups, but do not force the same solutions on all groups.

The roles of English and French languages in Quebec: We feel that encouraging bilingualism and exchange programs is the way to go.

Quebec's future in Canada: We feel some reduction in federal overlap is desirable. Introduction of some of the Swiss structural framework, like in the Allaire report, might work and would do us all some good.

The place of the west, the north and the Atlantic: A more equally representative Senate may help as well as reducing trade barriers and exploring ways of getting to know each other better.

What does Ontario want? I think we want to reduce trade barriers. We want more regional representation right in Ontario itself and some form of proportional representation in a united Canada, possibly based on the parties' percentage of the popular vote; and more ways of getting to know each other, such as encouraging exchanges across Canada.

I would like to give you an example of how the governments do not work presently, why the federal government has, I feel, abused its power. This is just a sample out of a linguistic myriad, just to give you an idea. I suppose you are all aware that the federal government actually paid money to a church in Quebec to paint a picket fence. This was the Liberal government, but it is to the point. Why is the federal government in that kind of business? The government should be working with the citizens, not against them.

For example, there has been a rabbit industry in Ontario for many years, but we have no federal inspection of rabbit meat in Canada. However, the federal government has subsidized the rabbit industry in Manitoba, Quebec and New Brunswick. And where do you think the surplus rabbits go? They come into Ontario. The federal government also, quite rightly, being involved in foreign affairs, imported frozen Chinese rabbit into Canada. Where do you think they sold them? In Ontario.

There is no federal consultation with our industry and the Ontario government was nowhere, and we are currently fighting the federal imposition of the GST on rabbit

meat because they seem to consider it is a different meat than beef. We are also finding that we are having finished rabbit being dumped from the United States.

Somehow the government knows so little about an industry in its own country which has been going on so long, and using taxpayers' money against the taxpayers. I think it is high time that there is more representative government in this country, both at the federal and provincial levels.

We also have the fact that some of you from Queen's Park may not be aware of, but you have the brightest engineers in the world. They know exactly what the size of the ducts should be under our sidewalks out here in the rural areas, so every year it gives us a lot of backhoe work because the ice freezes up and the water will not go under the driveways because the standards are set in Toronto where all the know-it-all engineers live. The engineers up here may have gone to the same schools, but they are not accepted and what they say does not count.

So we have a problem with government, federal and provincial. That is all. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, sir.

ELAINE FRITZ

The Chair: I call Elaine Fritz. I will ask the Vice-Chair to take the chair, please.

Ms Fritz: Honoured members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. My presentation is based on the fact that democracy is the natural ending to a society that is on the road to evolving a social conscience.

On doing the research to support this concept, I became aware that social conscience and survival of the species were one and the same. Democracy tries to embody this principle by first of all stating that all people are created equal or, as I like to put it, under the eyes of God everyone is equally important. In other words, no one should hold himself up as being better nor his aims to be more favoured than each and every other cohabitant on planet Earth.

Imagine my surprise and dismay when the GST went through with at least 80% opposition. I had assumed that we were living in a democracy. I guess that comes with watching too much American TV. I started researching our government system and found out that we were doomed from the start, because Sir John A. MacDonald did not want representation by population when he set about designing Confederation.

He also did not want to be dictated to by the common rabble, so he devised a system where we elect our politicians to decide issues for us. Another blow, because most grade 10 students are being taught that politicians are our representatives and take our opinion to Parliament. Another American myth, where over there, when the representatives are not sitting in the Legislature, they are indeed going from town to town, polling their constituents, how they would like their representative to vote on certain issues.

Now that I understood fully that I did not live in a democracy, I then went to the heavy books to find out more on the subject, and through that reading it became evident just how precious democracy is and how I believe

we must get back on track to obtain it for our country of Canada.

If we are honest, we can give men the benefit of occupying the world in a community form that encompassed mining and development for no less than 35,000 years. In 1 that time, to the best of our knowledge at present, the world has only had two bright blips of democracy: one over 2,000 years ago that lasted for about 150 years in Athens; and right now, across the border, for no more than 100 years and on paper, because there are still some disparities. But at least the ideology is on paper, and they have a goal to work towards. All the rest of the time, the world has been under dictators, military leaders, kings and queens, czars, emperors, chieftains, etc.

I panicked when the threat of racism reared its head during the Meech Lake debate. There is no democracy in favouritism of any kind, especially when Canada is not the Canada of 100 years ago. The fabric has changed and so should our thinking. Even granting separate school support would be against the democratic principles of a future, theological Canada because it shows favouritism over other religions.

As a Catholic, I was disappointed that the religious others did not go after rights for everyone and simply allow anyone to turn their taxes over to the faith of their choice. The alternative that would have been more sensible for the Ontario government would have been to have an educational system based on safety, considerateness and respect so that all these other religions would find the provincial system desirable.

When you took out the Lord's Prayer from the system, when municipalities say that no longer will they allow the nativity scene in front of their building over Christmas, this only serves to foster bigotry and distrust of ethnic groups, because you are taking something away from those who have. Instead, Ontario should adopt a policy not only allowing the nativity scene, but also encouraging a participation by all other ethnic groups to use the facilities and to highlight their customs.

We would all be enriched by the information, not diminished by the policy of taking away to make equality. With regard to the Lord's Prayer, come up with a declaration at the beginning of the schoolday of belief in equality and respect to replace it with, sort of a code of conduct that applies to all. Always add to our enrichment, not take away. Come up with some ideology envisioned for Ontario and Canada that is based on equality. After all, why did we get rid of slavery if it was not a recognition of the common dignity and value of all men?

If there was only one thing that you take from my presentation, I wish it to be that the very first plebiscite that we should have across Canada would be, "Do we want Canada to be a democracy?" Then everything would fall into place and we can go from there. By deciding to continue the journey to democratic rule, that is, representation by population and not politicianization, then we can formulate a proper Constitution that reflects our beliefs in the equality of the citizens of the country.

More has to be done about fostering a respect for each other and a respect for property, which I do not see right

now in our laws. There should be a set of Canada's working papers that determine the standard of time we use, the calendar system, the language, that can be changed over the years as needed. We should not have language, whether French, English or whatever, in our Constitution. That should be saved for the ideology of the country and should be almost sacred.

The Vice-Chair: You have one minute left.

Ms Fritz: Okay. Indigenous peoples: When the first settlers arrived on the shore of North America, they purchased land from the inhabitants, eg, the island of Manhattan for \$24, thus establishing a recognition that the original peoples indeed owned the land.

It is also important to recognize the concept that by allowing immigrants to buy up areas, the Indians were putting the white man on reservations and feeling that they could use the land between for travelling back and forth. This view, from a different perspective, is worth repeating. The Indians were putting us, you and I, on reservations, not the other way around. As soon as we accept this fact, maybe we can approach the settlement of land claims with proper humility instead of the arrogance so far exhibited.

As for the Quebec issue—

2100

The Vice-Chair: Could we ask you to conclude, please?

Ms Fritz: Yes. With regard to the Quebec issue, you will find in the papers I hand around that you should join the 21st century and notice that when you look across your borders at the rest of Canada, there are not 20 million British any more. Change the language of English to UNI, for United Nations Initiative, so that it will take the sting out of it. I guess language is not a culture, it is a communication. No one alive now was hurt by what happened on the Plains of Abraham, so we should not say that any more. It is impossible, nonsense, no one was there and no one is 300 years old. I think that if we take the racism out of democracy and get back to equality we probably can build a nation—

The Vice-Chair: I have to ask you to stop. You have gone way over your time.

Ms Fritz: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you.

ROSS CAMPBELL

The Vice-Chair: Ross Campbell.

Mr Campbell: Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, you have my submission. I would like to forgo most of the papers that I have written you and cover just a very few items.

One is in reply to the question on page 5 of the paper and here I state that I do not believe any change is necessary in that every Canadian citizen has his or her right under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and I believe this applies to everyone. Therefore there really is no necessity for a Canadian Constitution.

I think that these same rights and freedoms should apply to all businesses and corporations also. There can be no favouritism to any one person or group. I also believe

that these rights and freedoms should have no basis on any ethnic group or any person that resides in Canada. They should be all for everyone.

On page 18, there are a number of questions, three as a matter of fact. One, there should be no distinctiveness other than language. Two, let Quebec keep the French language but it must live by the same laws as the rest of the population. Three, I am convinced that the only enhancement Quebec will accept eventually is the total dominance of the country. Witness what has happened in Florida, where a large number of francophones take up residence in the winter months.

You can refer yourselves to newspaper articles and that type of thing for the answer to that. During the past two years, my wife and I have travelled Canada extensively, including the Yukon and Newfoundland, and with the exception of a little undercurrent of resentment in some parts of the west, we were accepted as fellow Canadians and enjoyed fine hospitality. I cannot say the same for Quebec, where we felt that we were really not wanted. This was not in remote areas but in well-travelled tourist areas.

My name is Ross Campbell and I reside at Kenrei Park in Lindsay. I am retired, I am 67 years old and a veteran. I am not aware of the political situation prevailing in Belgium now but I well remember, just after the war, when the French part of the Flemish population was attempting to foist its language on the total population of that country and there was a great hullabaloo about it.

Appeasement will not satisfy the francophones. They have disliked the British since Trafalgar, then Waterloo, then the Plains of Abraham. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

ALLAN O'DETTE

The Vice-Chair: Allan O'Dette.

Mr O'Dette: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I feel a little cheated. I have had to chop my text in half late in the day, and I hope the general thrust is still here.

I would like to thank the Chair for recognizing me tonight and at the same time applaud the government and the opposition members for their commitment to allowing the people of this province an opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns on this matter. We may look back on previous constitutional discussions and conclude that their failure was in part due to the lack of public consultation in any meaningful way towards the process of reform. If the people of this province expect the country to pull through this stage of constitutional development on its own, I am afraid they may be sadly disappointed.

I wish to address this committee because I am committed, as all of you are, to reaffirming Canadian unity. Short of delivering the message that my vote would be cast in favour of a renewed federalism, I wish to add further a few general comments on why I think Canada should remain united and a few short comments on how we may strengthen the fabrics that bind us.

This forum is useful on several fronts. For instance, I think it is allowing people to renew their faith in the public process—Lord knows that has been in decline for a long time—and also facilitates a need for the people to vent the

very emotional anger that has brought us to our current impasse. We must, as a society, rekindle our appreciation of our neighbouring partners and cultures. If we fail to understand what drives each other, surely we stand little chance of success in the future to work together on other fronts.

Our hope lies in future generations and in their understanding and tolerance of those around them. Barthélemy was heard to say that tolerance of opinions which are thought to be innocuous is as easy as acts of charity that entail no sacrifice, but the test of a free society is its tolerance of what is deplored or despised by a majority of its members. The argument for such tolerance must be made on the grounds that it is useful to society, that free societies are better fitted to survive than closed societies.

The very idea of a multicultural, bilingual nation excites me. After all, our nation was founded on these very premises. The advantages of this in the next decade and beyond could be the very strength that allows us to maintain our current high standard of living.

My lay perception of recent constitutional failure, or at least failure to reach consensus, can be found in what I contend to be the "we versus them" attitude towards reconciliation. In other words, in my opinion the provinces and interest groups alike have focused only on their part, and we may have lost sight of the broader goals that need to be achieved from a more focused attention on the needs and goals of the whole. I have heard countless testimonies from interests that see their concerns as paramount to any further discussion. Now is the time to speak for Canada.

As all of you are aware, the economic world has changed, and is in fact ever-changing. No longer will we be blessed with the manufacturing sector providing low skilled employment that has provided millions of jobs for Canadians over the last few decades. The whole face of the labour economy is changing, and perhaps changing for good. Some of you may argue that this is part and parcel of free trade, but I think the problem is more far-reaching than that. We might want to turn our thoughts and our abilities to being competitive in this global community.

2110

At this point, it does not really matter whose fault it is for all these job losses. What we must come to terms with is the fact that in many respects the world is a smaller place and figure out a way of competing in it. I argue that all Canadians will be better off competing collectively borrowing on different strengths from various parts of the country to ensure our place in this new world economy.

As we move forward into the area of global economy relations we must, as a nation, be prepared. That means our workers must be skilled, our industries on the edge of development. We must turn our thoughts to developing our own natural resources in our own backyards for export around the world. Governments must work together at all levels in a co-ordinated effort to promote and market our people and products.

I argue that Canadians would further sustain and regain their rightful place as an exporter of goods and services if seen collectively as offering the best of all worlds for foreign investment. I will just wrap up here.

Mr Chairman, upon your return to Queen's Park, I would ask you to remind the Premier of Ontario of the enormous responsibility the people of this province have bestowed upon him. I ask this in light of a comment made shortly after his election with regard to the priorities of constitutional discussions. I would also ask that you remind the Premier of the high level of leadership expected of him and his government throughout the rest of Canada. Clearly, Ontario must be seen once again to be a national leader in its contribution to reshaping the constitutional framework of this great country.

Let me also urge this committee to continue to provide and encourage individuals to participate in these discussions in the weeks and months to come. Further, I implore members of the Legislature to find ways of further facilitating the means by which community and business leaders can become more involved in a consultative process. In one final note, I would leave you with one message, and that is one of tolerance for people. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

ZITA DEVAN

The Vice-Chair: Zita Devan. You have the opportunity of being the last speaker. If there is any time left over, maybe we can have questions.

Mrs Devan: I am reminded of the scripture that the last will be first.

My name is Zita Devan and I am a resident of Lindsay. In a voluntary capacity I am chairperson of the Victoria County Access to Permanent Housing Committee. I have come here this evening to represent a silent majority: those low income citizens of Ontario and Canada who are not adequately housed. They come from all walks of life, from all ethnic origins, races and colour. Their only commonality is that they are poor.

In reading your discussion paper *An Invitation to Talk about Canada*, I read that Canada celebrates our country's diversity. But along with the cultural diversity comes a diversity that to a large extent is being ignored, that is, economic diversity. These differences that come from our various levels of social and economic stations result in a lack of equality.

The Canadian Constitution prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability, ethnic origin, race and colour, and asserts that our Charter of Rights and Freedoms will be interpreted in a manner consistent with Canada's multicultural heritage. I encourage this committee to look at an ever-increasing population, our poor. This population is growing into a subculture, and they are being discriminated against because they are poor. Poverty is not only the result of discrimination; it is itself a form of discrimination. Poverty denies people equal opportunity and infringes on the dignity and worth of every person, and this is a fundamental premise of human rights protection.

Canada has agreed internationally to ensure that everyone has an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing and housing. One only has to look around in each of our communities or read the local newspapers to

see that Canada is in violation of these agreements as they relate to our citizens.

I ask this committee to make a recommendation to include what are referred to as social and economic rights, specifically housing as a right. This would establish that people have a constitutional right to a life of dignity. In addition, the charter should include all the human rights which Canada has recognized internationally, providing effective protection against the real sources of inequality.

A charter which includes the right to an adequate standard of living would articulate a shared vision of equality and social justice. It would also establish, once and for all, that poverty, hunger and homelessness are unacceptable in a country with the resources of Canada.

I encourage you to listen to my words without a question or an answer. The only question that should be asked is: Is it good for the people of Canada? If it should be, leave the how to others. Thank you for your time.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

ROSS JONES

The Vice-Chair: I have just been notified by the clerk that the submission by Ross Jones was called for at 8:50. I guess we went a bit too quickly, because when he arrived, he did not get a chance to present. With the committee's indulgence, another five minutes? Agreed.

Mr Jones: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I was here on time, honest. Evidently you were moving awfully fast today. I can guarantee you, last week when you were up north you were not moving this fast. Anyway, I would like to carry on, if I may.

My name is Ross Jones. I am a third-generation Canadian. My ethnic background is Welsh. I served in the Navy during the Second World War, and I am presently retired from CNR and living in Fenelon Falls, which I might say is a place to live.

I would like to start off by stating that I detest labels. In my opinion, that is what either the media or the politicians have perpetrated on the Canadian people. I would like to make it quite clear: I am neither an English- or French-speaking Canadian. I consider myself a 100% red-blooded Canadian who comes from Ontario. In my opinion, to label people like this is paramount to separating them.

I would like to suggest the following agenda for our country, although it is not perfect. Some people will even class me as naïve, but we have to start somewhere.

First nations' rights: Yes, they should be recognized. My interpretation is that they want to determine their own future. How about determining that future with the whole of Canada? Can they forgive us for our mistakes? Can they learn to trust us again? Would they join us to make one Canadian nation called Canada? We can only trust they will.

A strong central government: On this one, I think we would have to leave it to the politicians, who hopefully would not screw it up by rolling the dice.

Provinces: All provinces to be equal partners in a new or improved Confederation. Trade between provinces should be wide open. If something is manufactured in BC or Halifax, I should be able to buy it in Ontario.

Territories should be allowed to become provinces jointly or together or, if they wish, join one of the existing provinces.

Senate: The Senate should be elected every six years and never on the same year as a federal election. After all, they must justify their actions the same as federal MPs. If the people of Canada are going to pay them, which we will, then we must have some control and that will be at the ballot box. The same amount of seats for every province.

Western provinces: More representation for western provinces in Parliament. As I have stated, equality for all.

Supreme Court of Canada: No one province to have more than one seat on the bench. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms would remain.

Ontario: No one or two provinces to dominate. Ontario must relinquish some of its power and seats to other provinces.

Quebec: Quebec to be recognized as unique in its language and culture, but not to have any more power than any other province. I would like to quote a paragraph from the late Senator Eugene Forsey:

"The truth is that sovereignty-association in any form is a horse that can't run. If Quebec insists on becoming a foreign country, we can negotiate that. It will not be easy. It will not be pleasant. It will impoverish us all spiritually as well as materially. It will be a tragedy. But it can be done. But there is no way to negotiate dry water, boiling ice, sour sugar or stationary motion. Some people think we should be willing to swallow any kind of nonsense in order to preserve the unity of Canada. I am not interested in a

Canada that would just be a splash on the map with six-letter word scrawled across it."

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to wrap up.

Mr Jones: I will do that right now. It is my contention that a new or altered Confederation will benefit all provinces and also make sure that never again will any one province be able to tear our country apart. As John F. Kennedy said to Americans, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." With this thought in mind, I am sure we can forge ahead to make Canada the country everyone knows it is and should be.

In conclusion, I would just like to make one comment on the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. If schoolchildren cannot open their day with prayer, then suggest that now they open their day with a pledge of allegiance to Canada and our flag and sing the Maple Leaf Forever. Then maybe, just maybe, when asked, "Where do you come from?" their reply will be: "Canada. I'm a Canadian." Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: We would like to acknowledge that we have received some submissions from the member for Victoria-Haliburton, Dennis Drainville, from the I.E. Welton Secondary School in Lindsay, as well as students from the Norland Public School, the grade 8 classes. We have also received another submission from the Rev Gordon Young. We just want to acknowledge that we did receive those. Until 9 tomorrow morning in Toronto, bonjour adieu.

The committee adjourned at 2123.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 27 February 1991

Peterborough and District Labour Council	C-835
United Citizens' Organization	C-838
Association franco-ontarienne des conseils d'écoles catholiques	C-839
Conseil des organismes francophones de la région de Durham	C-841
Pat Jacobs	C-843
Canadian Abortion Rights Action League, Peterborough Chapter	C-845
Peterborough Collegiate and Vocational Institute	C-847
Weslock Lake Native Women's Association	C-850
Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens	C-852
Evening sitting	C-854
Douglas Hindson	C-854
Wilfred A. Day	C-855
Bob Brandon	C-856
Corris Dale Gates	C-857
Pat Adams	C-858
John Hollingshurst	C-859
Keith Bottoms	C-860
Gregory Wood	C-861
Robert Bowley	C-862
Sean Wasson	C-863
John Christmas	C-864
Eric Davis	C-865
Peterborough New Democratic Party Riding Association	C-866
Tom Robinson	C-867
Cliff Spicer	C-867
Suzanne Fritz	C-868
Boss Campbell	C-869
Ilan O'Dette	C-870
Alita Devan	C-871
Boss Jones	C-871
Adjournment	C-872

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
ice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
Member: Lee, Charles (York North L)
Member: Hurley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)
Member: Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
Member: Arnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
Member: Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
Member: Falkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
Member: Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
Member: McNeill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)
Member: Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)
Member: Winner, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

Stockwell, Chris (Etobicoke West PC) for Mr Eves
 Wilson, Gary (Kingston and The Islands NDP) for Ms Harrington

Clerk pro tem: Brown, Harold**Staff:** Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



19 1991

C-19 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 35th Parliament

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Thursday 28 February 1991

**Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation**



**Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel**

**Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron**



**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 35^e législature

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Le jeudi 28 février 1991

**Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération**

**Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel**

**Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron**

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Thursday 28 February 1991

The committee met at 0913 in room 151.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. This is a meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are proceeding with our hearings across the province, this being our fourth week of hearings; we are, today and tomorrow, here in Toronto at Queen's Park. We have a number of organizations to hear from this morning and this afternoon. We have set aside this evening to hear individuals, and we will continue our hearings tomorrow with both individuals and organizations.

KOREAN CANADIAN YOUTH FEDERATION

The Chair: We want to begin this morning by calling the Korean Canadian Youth Federation, Richard Lee and Jae-Gul Kim, to come forward. I just remind you, as we will the others, that we have allotted up to 15 minutes for each presentation. If you could leave time within that for questions, we would appreciate it.

Mr Lee: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the standing committee. My name is Richard Lee, and this is my colleague, Jae Kim. We are representing the Korean Canadian Youth Federation this morning.

It is one of the virtues claimed for a liberal democracy like Canada's that it has discovered ways in which dissatisfied groups can obtain redress for their grievances without resorting to civil disobedience or violence. But it has become obvious recently that the incidence of these very activities is an increasingly important and disturbing aspect of political life in Canada. I am, of course, referring to the recent Oka warrior incident, where the native people of Canada have chosen to adopt a strategy of confrontation in order to challenge the dominant forces in society.

I would like to stress that the Oka crisis did not originate simply from revolutionary romanticism. On the contrary, it derived mainly from a correct conviction that techniques of influence which are legitimate according to the mores of liberal democracy are impotent in relation to certain objectives, or when used by native Indians in particular. Witness, for example, the ineffective negotiations of the Meech Lake accord. We, as Canadians, were in the process of amending our Constitution and we let ourselves be taken hostage by one single province, without addressing the plight of our native inhabitants.

We, the members of the Korean community, and by extension of the ethnic community in Canada, find it extremely ironic that here is Canada today attempting to solve the French-English political schism, when we as a conscientious society have outright ignored the issues that our native brothers, the original inhabitants of Canada, have been voicing for as long as there was a country in this land.

We, as Canadians, take tremendous pleasure and pride in being considered more humane and socially enlightened than most other nations. Until the recent Canadian involvement

in the Gulf war, our nation was respected throughout the world as a bastion of peace and social justice. Our Canadian government historically has tried very hard to help less fortunate Third World countries to develop and overcome poverty through foreign aid, loans and technical assistance. I believe it is a wonderful thing to give, when we can afford it, despite the fact that we have a \$300-billion federal deficit. Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, do you not find it hypocritical that we are helping other nations to become like us, while our fellow native Canadians are living in Third World conditions?

Of course, we can argue that foreign aid by our federal government has been decreased. By all means, we can say that our federal government has established reserves where native Indians can live happily ever after. How do they live? They live in Third World conditions. And why do they have to be alienated from the rest of society? Our state policy towards natives lacks an attempt to integrate them in the daily activities of our society.

We as Korean Canadians are concerned about our own community concerns, but we believe native issues are more pending than any other minority concerns in Canada. We urge the government of Ontario to play an exemplary role in increasing awareness of native issues, as well as urging for the establishment of a binding, non-partisan arbitration board composed of regular citizens, both natives and newcomers—for all of us, except the natives, are in fact newcomers to Canada.

On this note, I would like to leave the floor to my colleague, Jae.

Mr Kim: Good morning, ladies and gentleman of the committee. I would first like to take this opportunity to say that both Richard and I appreciate this opportunity to speak with you about our concerns about the current situation we are faced with in Canada.

I feel, and I believe most Canadians would agree with me, that this standing committee is long overdue. The closed-door policy which we experienced with the Meech Lake accord and with the free trade agreement, agreements which deal with the future of all Canadians, was a contributing factor to the high emotion we often see today when Canadians debate the issue of the future of this country. While in a fully functional, representative democracy there would be the need for occasional citizens' forums like this, the existence of this forum represents less the vitality of the decision-making apparatus in Canada and instead represents more the failure of the federal government's policy of closed-door, so-called nation-building. As a young person, I am concerned that the voices of young adults under the age of 30, like myself, will only be a whisper compared to the voices of older adults who are in a position, due to acquired power and money, to be better heard.

I came to Canada in 1968 when I was five years old. I am, by all accounts, a second-generation Canadian of Korean descent. My parents chose Canada over the United States, over Australia, over South Africa, over Europe, because they knew of and believed in the special promise of Canada. Canada, they knew, had a tradition of tolerance, of far-sightedness when it came to international politics, and geographically as well as psychologically a sense of the realization of possibilities endowed to it in part by the vast size, touching on three oceans, of this country. This is a country with a tradition of respect for others.

Much is made of the fact that one of the strongest reasons people from other nations come to Canada is economic—indeed, this is one reason all our forebears used in deciding to come to this country—but very little is made of the fact that these new Canadians chose Canada over other nations.

In the 1950s, Canada was decidedly British and French in its people and its heritage. But from what I know from high school history, with the larger influx of new Canadians from the mid-1960s onwards the federal government started promoting the idea of a multicultural Canada. It was not long after this began, as well, that the Official Languages Act designated English and French as the two official languages of Canada, promoting a bilingual Canada.

Both multiculturalism and bilingualism are positive ideas for Canada. Bilingualism has not been achieved in this country. It has not been achieved because of the lack of political resolve and vision to complete the task of making this country truly bilingual. I believe strong leadership in educational reform in this country at the national level—that means national standards and benchmarks—is desperately needed. In an increasingly pluralistic world, a world shrinking significantly even as I speak, Canada does best by embracing its future, and I believe that this future is best served by national bilingualism. French and English are two of the major languages of the world, and Canadians will communicate, understand—because learning a language includes learning a different cultural perspective—and grow with the rest of the world effectively.

0920

Multicultural policy in this country is also riddled by rhetoric, hypocrisy and the lack of true political resolve. By multiculturalism, I mean the idea of people of different cultures living, working and sharing their thoughts and experiences together as citizens of a just society. As an idea, I believe multiculturalism is progressive and part of the answer to our increasingly pluralistic world. Indeed, we are the experiment for the future of the world. But as a policy as practised by the Canadian government, multiculturalism, like the policy of bilingualism, is not enough to address the issues of the Canada of tomorrow.

Multiculturalism as we know it maintains segregation and prevents the development of a realistically represented Canadian identity. Multicultural policy says that all Canadians are part of a cultural mosaic and that all are equal.

But often, Canadians of British and of French descent, including those in government, are more likely than not to consider themselves the only group of people who genuinely belong here in Canada. The natives are forgotten, not

really true Canadians, and so are the "ethnics," for they are not really true Canadians either. For most Canadians, if you are of anything other than French or English descent, you are of ethnic origin, an immigrant, and therefore you are "multicultural." Present policy does not reflect that multiculturalism as an idea should apply to everybody.

I get the impression sometimes with regard to the issue of multiculturalism that to "true" Canadians the extent of means attending local quaint cultural events a few days of the year so they can pat themselves on the back and point out to themselves just how neat it is that all these interesting people live in their country. Your family could have been in Canada for generations but you are still considered ethnic by both the politicians and the people on the street. As an ethnic, you are in truth a second-class citizen, because the "original" Canadians, the people who have defined the multicultural mosaic for you, have decided not to consider themselves ethnic. They feel that they themselves need no hyphenation.

That a government populated by a certain race or races of people can consciously or unconsciously bias itself towards its own people or peoples of the same colour can be seen in the example I observed a while back of US chief of staff Jim Baker being asked by television anchor Ted Koppel after the opening of the intra-German border about the possibility of refugees from East Germany being welcomed into America. This was on national TV. Without hesitation, Jim Baker replied affirmatively and positively. Considerations of the political implications of his statement aside, to be honest I have trouble believing that Jim Baker would have said that if it happened to have been mainland Chinese refugees pouring into Taiwan instead, or even Central American refugees.

To give another example, closer to home, recently Canadians of Japanese descent, as we know, who were interned by the Canadian government during the Second World War received compensation from the government but they received it through the ministry of multiculturalism. Is compensation of interned Canadians of Japanese descent an issue for the Ministry of Multiculturalism or for the Ministry of Justice? The government certainly has decided that this is not a Justice matter but a matter about being an ethnic. Is Multiculturalism the pot where you throw all your so-called ethnic issues? Or is there a greater point, a point about being Canadian, that is missing?

What is a Canadian? If you believe the government there is only one type of Canadian, and that is hyphenated that is, Canada is a multicultural mosaic populated by peoples retaining their own cultural identity while working and living in harmony. This is not realistic. The reality is that some Canadians believe they are more equal than others and present multicultural policy supports this reality rather than a more egalitarian solution.

On the other hand, it is noticed about the interaction of ethnic community leaders with the government—I get the impression sometimes that it is pork-barrel politics. People just want their piece of the action. There are problems on both sides of this issue.

A new vision of Canada is necessary, a Canada full of Canadian faces. This new vision of Canada must include a

ruly equal place for all Canadians. Multicultural policy, by its implicit message of segregation, is failing Canada's promise to be a land for all. We have forgotten that we need caulk to hold the tiles of the mosaic together. This caulk has to be the essence of being Canadian. We must think about Canada as it is now and as it will be in 25 or 30 years, and multiculturalism and thinking that out is an important step. How will the makeup of Canada change? What will being Canadian mean then? We are right now building for the future.

As a young Canadian, I am concerned about our present situation. People seem frustrated, without vision, without an answer. There is a lot of deep emotion running in the country. This must be toned down. I feel we have to cool some of the rhetoric and take some time to reflect on the basics of what it means to be Canadian. Perception is often reality and we must change our perception of what it means to be Canadian and what Canada means to us.

The Canadian tradition of respect for others, tolerance and compassion, has, among other things, allowed us to create social programs that are the envy of the world. I often get the impression that it is these social programs that make us Canadian. In fact, it is the other way around. It is our attitude behind these programs that makes us Canadians. Canada is a distinct society in itself. We often seem to forget this, feeling swamped by our neighbour down south. It is a country to be proud of, and indeed I am proud to be a Canadian.

The Chair: Thank you very much, gentlemen. There are a couple of questions. If we do them both briefly, we can get through both.

Mr Bisson: Have you been watching the proceedings over the parliamentary channel over the past while?

Mr Kim: Not really.

Mr Bisson: I will pass my question on, then. You would have had to have seen—

Mr Beer: Thank you for coming head on into this question of multiculturalism and how we define it, what we mean by it, because as we have gone around, one of the questions next to the issue of bilingualism has been what people mean by this term "multiculturalism." Some have even said to us that perhaps we need to get rid of it and come with another word, interculturalism or something, that can better express what it is we are trying to do, because we seem to have so many different kinds of meanings.

The part I think we have to really get our hands around is that there is a variety of services and programs government intends to offer to those who in the first place have newly come to the country, and I think there is a broad acceptance around those kinds of programs. I guess where we get into difficulty with the broad population is after that, what? Some people would simply say, "We don't want any hyphenated Canadians," but behind that is the sense that they really just want one kind of Canadian, that there will not be the diversity we feel is important.

Do you think we need to have government departments focused specifically on multiculturalism, that would bring together all of the different programs? Or is what you are saying that you want to see that reflected throughout the

government so that, as you were saying before, whether it is through the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, Education, that reality of multiculturalism is reflected there? Where is the balance between needing perhaps a special body focusing on particular issues and problems common to those who have more recently come to the country and may need certain kinds of assistance, whether in terms of language training or whatever, and getting this broader acceptance? It seems to me that if we do not solve that dilemma we will continue to have problems around what multiculturalism means.

Mr Kim: Multiculturalism being put into the ministry right now is—I did not get much sleep last night.

Interjections.

0930

Mr Beer: Is that where we should be focusing?

Mr Kim: Part of this business of letting immigrants come in and then acculturating them—is that the responsibility of a Ministry of Multiculturalism or is that the responsibility of the Department of Employment and Immigration? Can that be taken care of there?

What exactly is the role of the Ministry of Multiculturalism? I believe in the promise of multiculturalism. I do not believe in this present policy. I would like to see a reworking of the policy to take in a new factor, that 25 years ago we had a big wave of new immigrants come into the country, especially immigrants of visible minorities.

We are at the stage now where the types of programs that the Canadian government offered through the Department of Multiculturalism and so forth were quite acceptable, the level quite acceptable for the first generation of people. What you are seeing with Richard and I are people who are somewhere in between the two cultures, but it is not acceptable to us because we want to participate fully in the Canadian mainstream, whereas our parents I think were satisfied with less.

So the question is a matter of, what is going to happen in the next 25 years when you have a lot of these second-generation immigrants, second-generation Canadians coming of age? What are you going to do? How is the policy going to reflect this fact? I think multiculturalism as it stands now is not enough. It is certainly not enough for me.

Mr Lee: There has been a lot of criticism about the policy of multiculturalism in the sense that it is a policy of appeasement in order to quiet down ethnic disenchantment with the programs. I believe that you do need a multiculturalism policy, but then what the Multiculturalism department of each provincial and federal government should be doing is to educate and increase the awareness of our issues along with the other ministries and not just concentrate on the Ministry of Multiculturalism.

If we have a problem with the Ministry of Justice or the ministry of—I do not know, whatever ministry you have—the Multiculturalism department should be in charge of interceding on our behalf and facilitating our access to the decision-making processes, rather than segregating us and placing all our concerns and interests only in the Ministry of Multiculturalism.

Mr F. Wilson: Could I have time for a question of this group?

The Vice-Chair: We ran out of time, unfortunately.

CHINESE CANADIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL

The Vice-Chair: The next up on the agenda is the Chinese Canadian National Council. After that we are going to be calling up Mr Dorion and Mr Marchildon.

Mr Yee: Thank you, Mr Chairman. My name is Gary Yee and I am the national president of the Chinese Canadian National Council. Beside me is Amy Go, the national vice-president of CCNC. Amy will begin the remarks.

Ms Go: The Chinese Canadian National Council is an umbrella organization with 29 independent member organizations covering every province. At the local level, our member groups are active and diverse in many areas, including social services, culture, recreation, heritage language and advocacy. At the national level, we focus on advocacy and human rights and race relations.

I never thought our nation would come to this. I speak personally and for many others when I say I cannot imagine a Canada without Quebec, and yet this a real threat that we are facing now.

Although we are being hit with bad news on many major fronts, I still prefer to see the bright side. A poll reported in the *Toronto Star* earlier this week showed 42% in Quebec favoured separation and 42% opposed. Frankly, I was pleasantly surprised. My impression was that the vast majority of people in Quebec wanted out of Canada. However, let us not underestimate the real and legitimate discontent that is being expressed. At the same time, we cannot and must not ignore the significant concerns of other Canadians, including those of non-English and non-French backgrounds.

Out of adversity and challenge can come substantial opportunities. What the crisis of Canadian unity is forcing many Canadians to do is to consider the future of this country and the many important issues at hand, including those raised in your public discussion paper, *Changing for the Better*.

I just want to begin with some fundamental points.

First of all, we are all Canadians. I wish I did not have to state the obvious, but it is sometimes necessary. Yes, we are Chinese Canadians but we all share the same concerns as everyone else, whether it is about the economy, the environment, day care, traffic or other matters.

Very often I am being asked by my white Canadian friends, including those in the media, "Where is the best Chinese restaurant in town?" And very often during the Chinese new year we are called, "Is there going to be a dragon dance in Chinatown?" Or in the recent newspapers you have seen a lot of reports on the violent crimes in Chinatown. Then you would get calls such as: "So, are there any Asian gangs? What do you think of the Asian crimes?"

Very often we get all these questions, but rarely do they call us: "What do you think of Quebec? What do you think of the situation Canada now is facing? What do you think of Canadian unity?" We are always being seen as Chinese, not as Canadians.

I just want to make it very clear that we are Canadian and we share the same concerns as any other Canadian in the street about our unity, about the Quebec situation about the first nations situation and about any other environmental issues that we all face.

In addition to these concerns that impact on Canadian regardless of our background—of language, of our cultural heritage—we and other racial minorities have particular needs and issues which are of specific relevance to us. These would include employment equity, racism, human rights, language and cultural barriers, immigration, equal access to services and so forth.

Because of these particular concerns, the Chinese Canadian National Council has taken a number of initiative in the human rights and race relations field, including advocacy, education and research. CCNC has always made representations to both provincial and federal levels of government about the Meech Lake accord and multiculturalism policy.

For example, with respect to a number of issues raised in Ontario's current public discussion paper, CCNC has come out in favour of maintaining national standards and strong Charter of Rights and Freedoms, supporting the rights of the aboriginal peoples and recognizing the status of the two official languages in conjunction with Canada's multiculturalism policy.

Mr Yee: I would like to add with respect to bilingualism in Quebec that really, as a minority, we feel empathy towards the Québécois, and I think we have to show Quebec with our actions and our words that we want Quebec in this country, that we need Quebec in this country. It is so obvious, to me at least.

I think also the message has to be clear that this must be within the framework of a strong and united Canada.

From a very personal bias, I see that we need a strong federal government. I am quite concerned about the regionalism that is occurring and certainly I do not feel the current federal government has taken any steps to strengthen, whether it is national symbols or federal powers. Indeed it has done the opposite.

In this matter of supporting national standards and our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, I think once again our position there arises out of our vulnerability as minorities. The Chinese Canadian community has especially been singled out for unfair and racist treatment in the past. I think many of you may be aware of the Chinese head tax, for example, imposed from 1885 to 1923; \$23 million collected, in those days' dollars, worth about \$1 billion today from Chinese immigrants to Canada. No other group was forced to pay any entry fee like this to come into Canada.

Then, even worse, from 1923 to 1947, which is not that long ago, no Chinese were allowed into Canada. These were deliberate, racist acts of Parliament, our own politicians, as recently as some 40-odd years ago.

Really, our community lost several generations and we still have about 1,000 surviving head tax payers now who went through tremendous hardship, being separated from their spouses and their children for decades. I think this past touches many of us personally in the community, including myself.

But despite this past, and in fact as proven by this past, we share your commitment to this nation, and it can be seen that immigrants in particular do not take Canada for granted. We are willing to make accommodations. I have no problem acknowledging Quebec as a distinct society or accepting the status of two official languages or recognizing the diversity of regions and balancing regional disparity or promoting aboriginal rights. In fact, these are the things that help to define Canada and that make me proud to be a Canadian.

But of course there is also multiculturalism. Maybe it is a misused word and maybe it should be replaced. It has been the official policy of Canada since 1971, and from its roots in recognizing cultural diversity, I think it has evolved well beyond song and dance.

For racial minorities in particular, the emphasis on cultural diversity failed to impact on the areas that affected us in our daily lives: jobs, political power, education, policing, access to services and all those important things, and therefore race relations policies began to develop often as part of multiculturalism policy. I think one of the current debates going on is, should race relations be a part of multiculturalism policy or should it stand on its own as an issue of justice and human rights?

Regardless of this debate, the reality of Canada is that we are ethnoculturally and racially diverse and will become more so. There is no mainstream; we are all a part of the mainstream. Despite that, for racial minorities, we can never, ever escape the fact that no matter how large our numbers grow, no matter how integrated or successful we become, we will always be visible. Therefore race relations issues and, to a lesser extent, multiculturalism issues in general will play an increasingly important role in the future of this country, and really, you ignore it at your peril.

There is also a legitimate fear that regionalism and local loyalties may hinder the compromises that are necessary to unite a country. I think people have to realize that, in the same way, racism and ineffective race relations policies will hinder the unity of this country also.

Let me give you my theory of community development, of when people feel they can reach out. I think this was touched upon in the issue paper. It is more natural for people to feel closer to things that are familiar to them, that are close to them, that they have some control over, whether that control is real or apparent. For example, we might feel more comfortable with city hall or Queen's Park than Ottawa. We may start our community involvement in our churches or in our school or in a local community group before branching out to wider society. I think different people in different communities are at different stages of development or reaching out, but that is what we need to help save this country. We need more people to reach out, to spread their networks. That will make for a stronger community, a stronger neighbourhood, a stronger city, province, and ultimately a stronger nation.

But that is not the reality. Let's look at the reality. What do you need to reach out? What do you need to look beyond yourself? Sure, we can reach out. I can reach out; you can reach out. But that is a luxury for those who are

struggling to get by in their daily lives. Reaching out is a discouragement for those who make the effort and get rejected in return, or see no impact whatsoever. Reaching out is an insurmountable challenge for those without access or power or the means to be heard. Reaching out cannot be expected from those who have no sense of belonging or who have experienced racism and injustice.

If we want a strong nation, a mature nation, a nation where all people can act and think beyond their everyday surroundings, then we must be prepared to have an equitable and just society. As Canadians, we can be and we are model citizens and we will work hard to keep this country together. But we demand nothing less than to be free from racism and discrimination, to have employment equity, equal access to services, effective and sensitive policing, access to political power and recognition as full and not marginalized members of this society. Beyond the current pressing English-French and Quebec separation debate, this is the future of Canada that we must face.

Nous devons tous participer aux discussions sur l'avenir du Canada. Merci.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much. We have a couple of questions. I would ask you to be brief as much as possible or else we are going to go over.

Ms Churley: Thank you. I just want people here to know that I have the privilege of knowing Amy, and Amy is one of the activists who has done incredible amounts of work for the Chinese community and beyond the Chinese community in Toronto. I do not know if people here are aware of who you two are, but I am.

You mentioned the fact that a lot of people—and I think that is a problem that politicians have sometimes too—see Chinese Canadians or other ethnic groups as not having any interests that the rest of us have, like taxes and the environment, and I think it is important that you pointed that out.

The question I would like to ask you is, we have heard from a number of multicultural groups across Ontario, and some of the younger members in particular, who are fairly integrated into society saying that they do not see any reason why they should get any special attention, that there should not be multiculturalism, for instance, that it furthers the ghettoization of ethnic groups. I am just wondering what you have to say to those people, what you think about getting rid of ethnic programs and multiculturalism.

Ms Go: Actually, I would analyse that from several angles. First of all, we racial minority groups, visible minority groups, are very often subjected to the same kind of reports, the same kind of influence that other Canadians at large are subjected to. Our views on racism, on multiculturalism, are very much influenced by what we read in school, the education system, how the media portrays us and how the policies sort of convey the messages to us.

This is to say that racial minority groups are not different in our influences, so I am not surprised by members of our communities who belong to racial minority groups who believe that we should not be treated differently and sometimes they would not recognize the needs that particular members in the group would face. But at the same time,

we have to recognize the history and how they have experienced all this impact.

As Gary has mentioned, the multiculturalism policy has been extremely ineffective in how we deal with the issues that racial minority groups confront, particularly in the areas of racism and race relations. So part of that would then make the communities feel disenchanting, discouraged and it would lead them to believe that since the policies are so ineffective, we might be better off without them.

So I think there are two reasons that I can think of when people from racial minority groups raise those issues. But my view, and I am sure Gary and members of all communities would share the same view, is that multiculturalism should be distinct from race relations and racism is the key issue that we are trying to address now. There should be anti-racism policies. Multiculturalism right now is a coverup, is diluting the issue of racism in Canada. So we need to address that racism; we need to address race relations. It is very important to separate those issues, and then looking at multiculturalism, we should look at the issue also of differential access to power, access to services and access to participation.

0950

If we want to have a true multicultural state, then we need to look at that different power that each group shares and address that. So having an anti-racism policy and also addressing the issue of access is what we want. You may want to still call it multiculturalism, but we do not want the existing multiculturalism policy. We want a policy that addresses our needs. There are needs that are unique to our community, such as language barriers, and we cannot and we should not undermine those needs. Racism is also a key one that our communities are facing, as distinct from other groups.

The Vice-Chair: Can the Chair ask you to sum up a little bit, because we are running behind and there are other people to present.

Ms Go: Actually, I think I have basically answered your question. Have I?

The Vice-Chair: Thank you. I am sorry about that, but we are running behind.

What we are going to be doing—as you may be aware, for those of you who are on the list to present, we are falling somewhat behind—is that I am going to have to be fairly stringent as far as time is concerned. When a person gets near to the end of time, I am going to give you one minute and ask you to sum up within that time. If there is not time for questions, there will be no questions; and if we are into questions, I will do the same thing.

VINCE MARCHILDON
BASILE DORION

Le Vice-Président : Okay, next are Basile Dorion et Vince Marchildon. C'est en français ?

M. Marchildon : Oui. On fait tous les deux notre présentation en français.

Le Vice-Président : D'accord. J'ai ici sur mon horaire dix minutes, d'accord?

M. Marchildon : D'accord. Je vais tout raccourcir, merci de me donner du temps. J'aurais voulu vous parler de toute une gamme de sujets très importants en ce qui concerne notre province. J'avais même préparé — et j'y ai passé des heures à le préparer — ce que j'allais vous dire mais au fur et à mesure que les audiences se déroulaient travers la province, j'ai senti un besoin urgent de tout changer dans ma présentation.

Il faut encore une fois absolument que je vous parle pour moi d'un secteur dans notre société qui ne cesse de poser des obstacles à notre pleine participation à l'élaboration d'une mise en oeuvre pour un Ontario fort et prospère dans un Canada uni. Aussi longtemps que ces gens-là posent leurs objections, nous ne pourrions jamais procéder à la prochaine étape de notre dialogue.

Il me fait mal d'entendre ce secteur de la population m'accuser de manquer de ferveur envers le Canada. C'est dont on me reproche souvent — et j'ai passé trois heures à défendre la Loi 8 à une ligne ouverte radiophonique dans la péninsule du Niagara l'année dernière — c'est d'être un Canadien à trait d'union.

C'est ironique mais c'est en lisant Shakespeare à l'école que j'ai trouvé une phrase qui a toujours formé la base de ma philosophie de vie : «To thine own self be true». C'est l'année dernière à cette émission de radio que j'ai finalement trouvé une réponse à tous ceux qui voudraient mettre en question ma ferveur canadienne parce que j'ai passé presque tous les jours de ma vie à me battre pour être un Canadien, à négocier mon canadianisme. La réponse que je leur donne maintenant, peu importe qui me pose la question, toujours en français : «Je suis Canadien». Dans cette réponse il n'y a aucun trait d'union.

Les gens dont je parle ont le mot «préservation» dans le titre de leur association. On sait de qui je parle. Si je pouvais accepter la moindre sincérité et honnêteté dans ce qu'ils me disent, je pourrais m'asseoir à leur table et partager tout un vécu de ce que ça veut dire que de préserver quelque chose qui est en voie de disparition. J'aimerais donc pouvoir m'asseoir à leur table mais je doute de leur sincérité constamment. Je vous donne seulement deux exemples pour terminer.

Ces gens-là se lamentent de la disparition de traditions canadiennes qu'ils attribuent à la présence d'immigrants dans notre société, et du même coup ils seraient prêts eux-mêmes à contribuer à la disparition d'un ingrédient essentiel à la tradition et à l'identité canadienne, c'est-à-dire de l'élément français. Je me suis senti envahi par la haine d'Orillia qui est dans mon territoire. Je me souviens que là y avait une dame qui parlait justement des immigrants et elle a attribué la disparition de son «Notre Père» dans les écoles à la présence d'immigrants. Chose intéressante c'est que dans le «Notre Père» on parle de «notre pain quotidien», et à l'entendre parler, nous devrions nous contenter des miettes qui tombent de sa table.

Je voudrais un jour revenir à votre table et parler sérieusement de ce qu'il faut pour un Ontario prospère et fort dans un Canada capable d'assumer ses responsabilités sur la scène globale. Mais avant d'aborder cette étape importante dans notre dialogue, il faut absolument que ces gens-là s rendent compte que leurs paroles n'auront jamais plu

l'effet que cette mauvaise graine qui est allée tomber sur un sol rocaillieux. Il faut absolument que nous nous sentions valorisés comme citoyens avant de pouvoir procéder à cette étape si importante dont je parle.

Pour terminer, ils veulent nous dire que la Loi 8 a eu pour effet d'impressionner le Québec et que si le Québec avait, les services en français prendraient aussi vite la route. Est-ce que nous, francophones, n'avons une valeur ajoutée dans le rayonnement du Québec ? Est-ce qu'il faut toujours que nous soyons tenus, disons, en otage quand il y a des jeux politiques ? Est-ce qu'il faut toujours que ce soit nous l'enjeu ? Montrez-nous que vous nous avez à cœur. Il n'y a rien qu'un Québec indépendant aimerait mieux que de voir un exode de francophones fiers et convaincus vers ses frontières. Nous serions sûrement considérés des immigrants de première classe. Mais je ne veux pas partir. Je ne veux pas partir parce que mon chez-nous, c'est ici en Ontario.

Permettez-moi d'être ce que je suis. Aidez-nous à vous aider. L'épanouissement de notre langue et de notre culture relève du leadership de gens comme vous qui sont conscients que la qualité, et je répète, la qualité d'une démocratie se mesure par le traitement qu'on accorde à ses minorités. Le moment du grand geste est venu dans notre province pour que, une fois pour toutes, nous puissions faire taire ces langues de vipères et parler ensemble d'autres choses qui sont très importantes.

Alors, le moment du grand geste : je vous demande de vouloir bien considérer de déclarer cette province officiellement bilingue pour que nous avançons ensemble vers d'autres paliers. Je vous remercie.

1000

Le Vice-Président : Merci beaucoup. Monsieur Dorion, il vous reste environ trois minutes.

M. Dorion : Merci. Je m'appelle Basile Dorion. Je suis natif de Lafontaine, tout près de Penetanguishene. Je travaille présentement comme agent de développement pour l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario chez nous. J'ai été conseiller municipal de 1973 à 1977 et je suis présentement, depuis 1977, au Conseil scolaire de Simcoe comme président de la section de langue française.

For expediency and comprehension, I will apply my translation skills to work so that I can get through this as quick as possible, and if there is time, we would welcome questions.

I have left with the clerk two other presentations of people from my area. I have left them with the clerk and I will not expand on them.

I am happy to be able to present my ideas and views this morning. We believe that Canada not only can survive but can flourish if there is a will and a leadership there on the part of our leaders to manifest that.

By visiting Sainte Marie des Hurons in our area you will notice that we, as a francophone community, are not newcomers to Ontario and we have been there for 350 years. The community I represent, like myself, is made up largely of families that have been there since 1850 or 1860 approximately. I am very happy and proud that my great-grandfather Dorion was baptized in Penetanguishene in 1868 and that my maternal grandparents, the Chrétien side

of the family, have been present on the shores of Georgian Bay since that time also. I think it casts no doubt on the fact that we are truly full-fledged Ontarians. How often will I be told, "Go back to Quebec"? Mr Chairman, my home is Ontario.

As a community we have gone through a lot of very difficult times, be it with regulation 17 of this province, going back through all kinds of conspiracies and crises, and yet we have survived all of these things, even though some groups or individuals wanted our linguistic and cultural disappearance. We have worked hard over the last 20 years to have all kinds of local institutions for our community with social clubs, cultural centres, our schools—

The Vice-Chair: You have one minute left.

Mr Dorion: —our community radio station and all of those things, and we want to continue having that. I cannot insist too much on the necessity of the provincial government to financially support our francophone organizations. Investing in Franco-Ontarians is investing in Ontario. We are very anxious to have at least as much as what the Anglo-Quebeckers have.

I think what is really lacking in this country is leadership, a leadership to really stand up to intolerance. I get very frustrated when I see some of our leaders, like Jean Chrétien, like Brian Mulroney, talk about the fact that there is no intolerance in Canada. I wonder where they are living. I think Ontario must play a leadership role.

I have left in my brief, and I will not have time to go through them, eight recommendations that deal with the three founding nations of this country—that is, the anglophones, the francophones and the native people—and also with regard to our multicultural society.

In summing up, I believe that Canada is worth saving and that Ontario can play a major role in this exercise. I believe that much more can be done on the federal scene to assure the respect and rightful place of our English, French and native communities. I know that Ontario can do much more to assist its francophone population in assuring its respect and continued development. I count on you and all my representatives to stand up for all of Canada, not only its individual pieces.

My ancestors and my Franco-Ontarians have survived through very difficult odds in this province. We have done so because Ontario is our home. Ontario is a part of Canada and we have faith in the future. If all of the above reasons, among others, do not show a clear commitment to Ontario and a clear commitment to Canada, then I guess there is no commitment to Canada and to Ontario. Merci beaucoup.

NATIONAL ACTION COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE WORKING GROUP

The Vice-Chair: Next up on the agenda is the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and the Unemployment Insurance Working Group. We would like to apologize for running a little bit late and we realize that you have some time lines that you have to hold yourselves.

Ms Ritchie: Thank you. My name is Laurell Ritchie and I am here on behalf of the employment and economic

committee of the Nation Action Committee on the Status of Women, comprising some 500 organizations across Canada.

I am going to turn now to Armine Yalnizyan, who will lead off the discussion and identify herself.

Ms Yalnizyan: Yes, I would like to say that I am representing the Unemployment Insurance Action Group, an ad hoc group that got together to fight the implementation of Bill C-21, the national legislation to change the Unemployment Insurance Act.

When we come before you this morning—and thank you for the opportunity to do so—we are not addressing political unity issues but the issues surrounding the social and economic strength of our nation. We feel that in Ontario political separateness or unity is not the only issue of concern to the people who live here and we feel that there is a real temptation right now for the provinces to bite the bait that the federal government is setting out for increasing provincial powers, especially tempting given the context of the current budget.

We believe that the nation is not just an economy, though it is very important—the numbers of jobs that are generated, where they are, the types of jobs and what they earn—but we believe that perhaps a greater expression of what you could call a national will is the way people care for one another. I know that sounds very sentimental, but I think that the concrete expression of the way people care for one another is the type of social programs we have in place.

I think it is no secret that we take great Canadian pride in especially three social programs—medicare, pensions and unemployment insurance—which have really marked the progressivity of our nation and our ability to care for one another across great, vast differences in cultural and economic regions.

I would like to point out to you that it is not just sentimentality. This is something of an abstract longing, but the desire, especially for a comprehensive Unemployment Insurance Act, came out of a broad social consensus which emerged out of a failed social experiment that people who are still living experienced. I am referring to the Great Depression, where market forces reigned supreme and were the sole arbiter of what people did with their working lives and, by extension, with their entire lives.

People rejected that as the sole mechanism of treating workers, rejected the notion of labour as simply a commodity, and demanded throughout the 1930s, and finally was implemented in the 1940s, some form of social insurance where we could pool the risk across different regions of the country and really take care of one another in times of economic despair.

When the Unemployment Insurance Act came in, it was accompanied not only with this notion of pooled risk but also a financial guarantee from the federal government that it would do its utmost to prevent the kind of economic conditions that led to the Depression. The unemployment insurance demands and the legislation that came about, the act that was implemented and the program that has been extant for 50 years, was based on a collective experience.

Nobody wants to relive that experience again—I think that is fair to say—yet the federal government has denied

the experience, wiped it from memory and rammed through legislation which was not an expression of popular will and which was only implemented after the federal government circumvented and closed down every democratic process available to the people of Canada.

Now we are being force-marched down the same road that we were walking down in the 1930s. We are watching history grimly repeating itself, with record numbers of employables on welfare rolls and we are being asked to repeat that same social experiment again. I ask Laurell to give you a brief history of what it is that we are trying to avoid.

Ms Ritchie: Yes, it seems that there is some collective amnesia operating within this country right now about what the good old days were like before we had this very important social insurance system within the country. Prior to the 1940s, jobless workers had only emergency relief welfare to turn to, which came through the municipalities; those that did deliver it, and only in a few situations did the federal government step in. About the only example we can really point to is a program of unemployment insurance for those returning servicemen from the First World War.

With the 1930s depression and escalating unemployment, those municipalities cracked under the strain of the welfare load and, in turn, there was public revolt waiting for the wings. At the same time, coming at it from a slightly different angle, economists, politicians and business people started to worry about the lack of money circulating within the economy, given the stagnation and the instability. When we had in 1935 was Prime Minister R. B. Bennett introducing for the first time an Employment and Social Insurance Act. Now this act actually invaded, at the time, provincial jurisdiction over labour and social welfare programs and there was then a six-year period while constitution amendments had to take place to allow the federal government to play a role. So it was not until 1941 that Canada had a functioning Unemployment Insurance Act, as it was renamed.

1010

There are two very important underlying principles of Canada's unemployment insurance system. First of all, it is a national system that pools the risk across all regions; that is, it establishes national funding arrangements and national standards for qualifying for benefits. This in fact presents an in-built equalization feature to this social insurance scheme. It is unlike commercial insurance schemes which normally require those who are most likely to encounter the risk—in this case, unemployment—to pay a higher cost and to meet higher standards of eligibility. We did not take that route. We took the social insurance route, pooling the risk.

Second, the other very critical feature of this is an explicit acknowledgement that the federal policies or lack of them played a significant role in the rates of unemployment across the country, and as a result there was a federal contribution when unemployment got high, when there were certain trigger levels for federal contributions, so that it was not just employee and employer contributions. What this did was create not only a penalty where the federal government was not providing proper programs for jobs

opportunities, but an incentive for the federal government to do better in the future.

Now we are going to ask you to look at and contrast is with what happened in the United States with its unemployment insurance program. It is the only country in the industrialized world that does not have a national scheme, one that puts into it federal, public purse moneys. What has happened there is that there is no pooling of the risk. Every single state has its own program. The standards vary widely according to the individual state's economic health at any one point in time.

A worker in West Virginia, which has one of the worst unemployment rates in the US, has in turn one of the worst unemployment insurance programs. New York state: The worker is more likely to receive benefits.

Overall, only one out of every three jobless Americans can get access to their unemployment insurance scheme. As well, as this is important for the women of this country we are going to examine a comparison, only five states provide maternity or parental benefits. What we have seen in the US is further erosion in the 1980s. It has reached the state where states with high unemployment exhaust their state trust funds of payroll taxes so quickly that cutbacks follow very soon thereafter. The poorer become poorer and there is a vicious circle of cost cutting built into the system.

What has happened with the federal government's Bill C-21 last year is that we have come full circle. We are now going to join the only other industrialized country in the world that does not contribute from the federal coffers. And although the federal minister, Barbara McDougall, tried to defend this in the introduction of Bill C-21, what he did say was very explicitly, and we have the text of her statement here, that those programs in the US are simply aodgepodge of state programs and she argued that there was nothing there to even harmonize with. But in fact C-21 is setting up a situation without federal funds where it has been essentially privatized. That program has been essentially privatized. It is set up for return to the provinces and I would argue, in the end, to move to commercialized principles rather than socialized principles of unemployment insurance.

Furthermore, C-21 has, with its drastic cutbacks, been an endeavour to erode the expectations of Canadian workers. This is particularly important for women in this country. Because of the nature of our jobs and the part-time work, seasonal work and so on, we are more likely to have to turn to this important system, and certainly for parental benefits.

What we have seen this week with the new budget is a literal time bomb. What happened in the United States is that with escalating premiums, no contributions from the public purse, employer organizations call for more and more cutbacks in the system and what we are seeing now is a loading of the deck to ensure that lobbying takes place in short order over the next couple of years. By 1993 if we do not find some political will in this country to reinstate this very important program with federal contributions, we face the same future that our American brothers and sisters face in the workforce confront.

Ms Yainizyan: I would just like to add that C-21, by withdrawing federal contributions and effectively dismantling the program, and again eroding people's expectations, offers a deadly combination with Bill C-69 because now we are getting more and more people having to turn to welfare, and we are just seeing the thin edge of it right now in Ontario. Bill C-69, as you know, caps contributions to the social assistance plans. So what you are doing is forcing people to go on to an even more pitiful social safety net, and that social safety net is getting torn right out from under them.

What can we do in Ontario concretely? What is it that we are asking you to do? I guess how we are asking you to view these programs is that this is an expression of national unity, that medicare, UI, pensions, social assistance, etc., are the paramount mechanisms to concretely rethread a national fabric which is being torn apart right in front of our eyes remarkably quickly.

In the case of unemployment insurance we would ask you, since every extra-parliamentary measure that we have used has failed to get through to this federal government, to negotiate a restoration of federal contributions which is an absolute minimum condition for the maintenance of this system, and to indicate to the federal government a clear commitment to national programs that support these principles of equalization of risk, of pooling risk, of providing for one another and caring for one another.

We believe that these concrete programs that now exist that are in the process of getting dismantled are the things that we have to be actively fighting to save at a time when they are being dismantled brick by brick in front of our eyes. We would ask you to do that on behalf of us as Canadians and as Ontarians.

The Chair: There is a little bit of time left. Are there any questions?

Mr G. Wilson: It is of course a really dismaying picture that you are portraying here. I was wondering what the ramifications of this are. You say there is politically little that can be done, or appears to be able to be done. I am just wondering about the frustration and despair that this raises and what are the outcomes of this. For instance, is that a good politically organizing atmosphere to work in or does that lead to, say, the discrimination that some of our other presenters have mentioned? Would you say that this is something that fosters a lot of acrimony rather than positive things?

Ms Yainizyan: At the national level of the UI working group, which was a series of groups brought together across the country, it was amazing the momentum that was built up in terms of bringing very diverse groups of people together to push, to say, "Let's reflect on the history we've had and not walk down this road again."

What was very dismaying was the way the democratic process was shut down. The only way that legislation got through was that the Speaker actually broke all previous rules and a deal was cut to push this legislation through. There was nothing in the democratic process that would have indicated that would have been the outcome. So it is very dismaying that we are operating at a federal level

where nothing that you can do through the normal channels makes a difference.

On the other hand, once you have got this legislation rammed down our throats, as Laurell was indicating, the type of forces that are unleashed and the time bomb that is in place is going to really increase intolerance between regions because they are going—Ontario right now is not doing that well, but let's take us back 18 months ago when the biggest drain on the program might have been fishermen's benefits in the Atlantic provinces. How long is a system that is privatized, with premiums that are increased by 24% just after they were increased to historic highs three months ago, how long are people going to accept "subsidizing" a very difficult economy in the Atlantic provinces?

If we do not have a national system of regional development and supporting these various types of economies with a plan of diversification and economic health, that system is going to go by the wayside. I think that is quite clear.

1020

Mr Beer: I think you have done one very valuable thing today, which is to underline the connection between a lot of the changes that have been taking place in Ottawa with respect to national programs through things that have happened in the budgetary process, where perhaps people do not recognize exactly how much they are linked to what we are all about, which is looking at the country, looking at the role of the Constitution, looking at national programs. I think that is one way in making clear to people that this exercise is not some sort of airy-fairy philosophical debate, but that we are talking about the blood and flesh and sinew of this country, and that these programs are part of it. I think we have heard this a couple of times, but certainly this morning you have put it more directly and emphatically than anyone else has. I think we have heard that message and we are really going to deal with it in this committee. I just wanted to underline that point in terms of what you said this morning.

Ms Yalnizyan: It is wonderful to hear that.

Ms Ritchie: We will leave some materials with you that describe what has happened in the US for American workers so you understand the slippery slope we are headed down.

ORGANIZATION OF SOUTH ASIAN CANADIANS

The Chair: Could I call next, from the Organization of South Asian Canadians, Audi Dharmalingham, Bala Nambiar, Malika Mendez, Murad Velshi and Sirish Sinha. Welcome, Mr Velshi, a former MPP at Queen's Park.

Mr Dharmalingham: My name is Audi Dharmalingham. I have with me to my immediate right, Malika Mendez and on the far right, Bala Nambiar. To my left, usually Murad does not sit on the left side, but he is Murad Velshi. We are very happy to have this opportunity to make the presentation. There is one small mistake in the submission made. At the end of page 1 there is a very crucial line missing. It should read, at the end of the line—

The Chair: If you would just wait a second, sir, with that correction, the submission is just being distributed

now. Could I also, while we have this brief pause, point out to people that there are translation devices available believe they are either at the back of the room or outside and that will facilitate people being able to have access to the interpretation, both English-French and French-English, members of the public are welcome to get those if they wish to assist in the presentations.

Mr Dharmalingham: At the end of page 1, it should read "deliberately shut out from channels of participation in any of these discussions about the future of this country. That is what you should add. I am asking Miss Mendez to present the brief.

Ms Mendez: We would like to thank members of the select committee for giving us this opportunity to make known some of our views concerning the future of the nation and Ontario's pivotal role in shaping that future.

Who are we? The Organization of South Asian Canadians, or OSAC, is an association of community groups of individuals in Ontario. We have been, for the past several years, active in profiling and promoting our community's political, economic and social goals. South Asians represent those of us settled in Ontario with origins in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. It is estimated that there are a number at least 500,000.

Our community is well aware of the political efforts that have been undertaken in the last two decades to bring the two founding nations together. While the English and French politicians at the federal and provincial levels dominate and literally control the diatribe, the native population and other citizens, including those of us who make up the multicultural reality of Canada, have been virtually and deliberately shut out from channels of participation in any of these discussions about the future of this country, and more importantly ourselves. There was never a plan or a process to include us. For the gamblers who rolled the dice, we simply do not exist.

It took an Elijah Harper and military intervention in Oka, Quebec, this past summer to shed the scales that blinded politicians at all levels. Now the Spicer committee, quickly formed to gauge the national sentiment, looks like an addendum, an afterthought, to a well-hidden agenda that bombed at Meech Lake.

It must be pointed out that given the many complexities surrounding the issue of national unity, the hurried consultations and discussions, including these quick hearings in Ontario, do not lend themselves to a thoughtful and reflective process of participation of citizens to articulate our visions for the future of our adopted homeland. These deliberations must be given more time. However, we are grateful that in Ontario a process has been found and we feel as if a window is now open for us to begin what we expect to be a meaningful process of communication.

Given the short time available and the immense challenges that one faces in prescribing unity solutions, we have decided to limit our attention at this time to the most pressing problem facing our community, which parallels some aspects of the Quebec syndrome. Underlying all this frustration, mistrust and fear in Quebec is the discrimination that Quebecers have endured under policies and practices

other governments, provincial and national, controlled the anglophone majority in Canada.

Although measures were taken from time to time to uphold and declare human rights, equal rights, cultural reservation and language rights, the mindset that managed to alienate an entire province within this country for decades continues to manifest itself today in so many different ways.

Our community represents a significant number of the members of the visible ethnic minority in Ontario. We have all arrived here with the intention of contributing our most to the economic welfare of this nation, thereby bettering ourselves and the communities that we live in. But we have found and continue to find that almost at every turn we make to achieve progress, there is always an unspoken and unwritten set of conditions of discriminatory practices to keep the visible ethnic minority out of the mainstream of events and opportunities in Ontario and in other parts of Canada. These practices of discrimination are deliberate, systemic and institutional.

Recent investigative work by Allen Borovoy of the Canadian Civil Liberties Association reveals that many placement agencies connive and co-operate with employers in their referral and recruitment practices to screen and keep out visible minority candidates. We know that this does not come as a surprise to the select committee members, because this issue has been well-studied and documented in the last little while. Politicians of all stripes are well aware of this problem and some have even developed a high degree of tolerance to this cancer of racial discrimination in our society.

Our main concerns regarding the fostering of national unity are the uncertainties and the unhappiness that we, as individuals and groups, experience with regard to our future in Ontario and in Canada. We are frustrated with and agonize over the lack of employment equity and the underemployment of our people in the workplace. When equal opportunity for work and advancement in professions and trades is taken away from those who struggle to make a future for themselves, one takes away the most precious qualities in human life that make the difference between success and failure: initiative, drive and industry.

What we face in Ontario and in Canada is not equality of opportunity, but a hierarchy that practises traditional and deliberate discrimination against visible minority groups. If our deep-seated, job-related concerns and aspirations are not fairly and justly met, we fear that the prevailing conditions may create disaffected pockets of visible minority groups in Ontario that parallel the disaffected groups in the Quebec of yesteryear.

030

An account of the inequities in employment opportunities would be incomplete without drawing your special attention to the additional barriers facing the women in our community. Three pieces of information that are pertinent to Canada and Ontario are provided to illustrate this point.

Fact: Visible minority women make up approximately 50% of the visible minority workforce.

Fact: Approximately 76% of clerical or unskilled positions are held by visible minority women, many of whom have professional backgrounds.

Fact: Visible minority women are paid a third less than visible minority men, who in turn are paid less than their white counterparts.

This profile of minority women closely reflects the profile of South Asian women. The plight of visible minority women is the plight of South Asian women.

Employment equity in Ontario: Under the provincial employment equity initiative, five target groups are identified: the disabled, francophones, natives, women and visible minorities.

A secretariat reporting to a minister of the crown was created for the disabled to look after their special and specific needs; for the francophones, the Office of Francophone Affairs; native affairs are now the responsibility of another minister of the Crown; and for women, the Ontario women's directorate reporting to a minister. Four of the five disadvantaged target groups have representation in cabinet. Visible minorities alone have none. Why?

The roles of the Ontario Human Rights Commission and the race relations board are limited to the enforcement of statutes through negotiation or prosecution after the fact, and are not designed to be proactive.

What do we want? Justice and equality demand that the government of Ontario remove all the inequities so the visible minorities in the province need not wait as long as the natives and francophones to attain equal rights and recognition.

In this regard it is essential that:

1. The employment equity commission immediately undertake steps to prepare for the enactment of an employment equity act with clearly defined targets and time lines set for visible minorities to achieve employment equity in the Ontario civil service, the broader public sector and the private sector.

2. In Ontario's proposals for changes defining a new Canada, employment equity be given the highest priority for entrenchment in the Canadian Constitution.

In conclusion, may we commend the government of Ontario for initiating public discussion of Ontario's role in the Canadian Confederation. We also urge the government of Ontario to continue its leadership role in helping the people of Ontario to focus on national and constitutional issues.

Mr Nambiar: We are convinced that by and large the thinking people of Ontario who matter in today's Ontario are fair and would like to do things right. If something is not done right, we would like to think it is perhaps more by default and apathy rather than by deliberate and wanton action. That is what gives us the confidence that our just causes will be heeded.

We are asking for justice and equity, not only for ourselves—that is, the first generation of new Ontarians—but even more for the second generation, many of whom were born and brought up in Ontario, went to some of the best schools in the country and in the province and have participated in almost all areas with other Ontarians and have held their places. If there are no role models for them to

emulate, and if on the other hand they perceive latent or patent discrimination by the establishment, you can well imagine not only their frustration and negative feelings at the micro level but equally at the macro level, the waste of resources by their potential not being used to the fullest. This, we feel strongly, will be a major impediment to Ontario securing its future in the international economy.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I have two quick comments on a couple of points you made. Thank you, first of all, for the presentation and bringing to our attention your perspective in a very clear way.

On one of the points you made about the process and the seeming nature of how fast we are going through this—although it is fascinating for us to hear that, given the number of locations we have visited and the number of people we have heard from, which must be nearing the 500 mark by now, or will today or tomorrow if it has not already—I wanted to say to you that we recognize, notwithstanding that, that there still needs to be a great deal more discussion and other opportunities to allow the people of the province input into these decisions.

I think the trick is to balance that with the continuing calls for a sense of leadership and a sense of direction on the part of our government as well, and on the part of the leaders of the province. We are confident we can find the balance between those two, and we will in the second stage of our work structure ways to make sure the discussions do continue, so this is not a one-time opportunity. There will be others.

The other thing I wanted to say is in response to your point about the fact that visible minorities have no access through a particular minister or ministry. I may be wrong, but my understanding is that they do through the Minister of Citizenship. I think that is one of the responsibilities attached to that. But there may be perfections to that which need to still be developed. That is not trying to argue with your point on that.

Mr F. Wilson: We have had many presentations by ethnic and multicultural groups over our journey through the province. They have been very confident, very passionate and very consistent and hopeful that our nation can be saved, that there is salvation for Canada. But in a few of them, yours in particular—perhaps it is my awareness that is making me focus on this this morning—there has been an underlying feeling we have been getting that because of the previous tendency to use multiculturalism as a political football, to make mileage and gains out of it politically, there is a chance that perhaps the ethnic groups within our province may be getting a feeling of cynicism towards the system.

I do not want to give this any more credence than it does have, or I do not want to make an alarmist question out of this, but as you have directed yourself towards that I wonder if you would elaborate. Is there a possibility, because of the way we have handled the multicultural issue from the top down, or from the controlling ethnic group down, or whatever way you like to put it, that cynicism could arise within the various groups and perhaps negate

the whole process by having them turn inwards or turn away from the system? Is that a possibility?

Mr Velshi: I think we have to differentiate here between what multiculturalism stands for and what employment equity stands for. One of the previous delegations was listening to also mentioned this, that one has nothing to do with the other. Multiculturalism is a subject for discussion at another time, and it is a very lengthy discussion I dare say. There is no sense getting into that now because we are not going to be discussing multiculturalism here. We have left it out deliberately just to let you know that there is no connection between racism and multiculturalism. One has absolutely nothing to do with the other. There are certain aspects of multiculturalism I may not like in which Mr Dadamo may like, but we have not discussed that so we are not able to answer your question the way you pose it.

Mr F. Wilson: Allow me to rephrase it, then, because I think it is important. Let me put it in context this way. We are finding that the so-called majority, the European majority or the white majority or whatever, is very cynical about the process. They have actually turned off as far as connecting with government is concerned. They do not think it matters. Previous presenters said that using the system just has no effect any more. I am wondering if that could become a prevalent feeling within the ethnic communities, the visible minorities, whatever phrase you wish to put upon them.

1040

Mr Velshi: Multiculturalism works well for ethnic communities. I am not talking just about visible minority communities: The Ukrainians and the Italians and just about everybody benefits from multiculturalism by getting grants. I am not too sure that is how multiculturalism should work. I think there should be transculturalism. If grants are given it should be for one community to meet another community. I do not think it is working the way it is meant to work. That is my viewpoint, again, and it may not be the viewpoint of this committee. Yes, some people are cynical about multiculturalism in a big way, because it is definitely isolating people. It is making them look inward. What you need is something to turn them around and look at the other groups.

But whatever multiculturalism does, it still does not allow us our job promotions, our entry into the job market and those things, and that is what we are talking about. I feel personally that if employment equity were initiated by enactment in the Constitution half our problems would be over. We are so busy trying to survive that we are not able to look at anything else right now. There is a lot of frustration in the visible minority communities. We see people bypassing us in jobs, we find entry-level positions are not available to us. The big positions we do not even see; they are somewhere in the stratosphere as far as we are concerned. What is happening to those? Talking about employment equity, if 7% unemployment is prevalent in Ontario then the blacks should have the same percentage 7%, they should not be at 14%. We should not be at 10%

we want to be at 7% also, like everybody else in this country.

Ms Mendez: To answer your question, if any political process does not result in something useful for the community, then of course there will be cynicism and turning away from that process, just to answer your very important point. Cynicism will set in if the process is not going to work.

Mr Dharmalingham: Could I add to that, Mr Wilson, at the way multiculturalism came into being—we form a new generation, the third sector or the third factor as they call it. Even when the idea came, the idea was that multiculturalism would address the equality issue, but it never came. It became a song and dance. If you talk to people in the community, half our people, they will say, "Multicultural song and dance, we are tired of that." What we want is an equal share, an opportunity to participate. There is enough talent in the community. In the area of multiculturalism, if people are given the opportunity to feel they are Canadians and still maintain their heritage, and still compete with anybody else and have the job opportunity, then it should work, but it is not happening. It is on paper, but in practice it is not.

The Chair: We will end at that point. Thank you for your presentation.

CANADIAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, ONTARIO REGION

The Chair: I call next the Ontario region of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, Sheldon Godfrey and Jamshed Mavalwala.

Mr Godfrey: While our brief is being distributed, I introduce myself. I am Sheldon Godfrey, and this is Jamshed Mavalwala. We are here on behalf of the Ontario region of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews. It is very unusual for us to be delivering briefs to any level of government anywhere. With that, I will turn it over to Mr Mavalwala.

Dr Mavalwala: The Canadian Council of Christians and Jews is an organization of people of goodwill that was founded in 1948 as a result of anti-Semitism and the Second World War. Its Ontario region, which we represent, was established in 1979. According to the founding documents of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, "It is an association of men and women who seek by educational means to promote justice, friendship, co-operation and understanding among people differing in race, religion or nationality." It derives its financial support from major corporations, as well as the public at large across Canada.

The council was originally established to fight anti-Semitism in Canada, although its programs today are directed, through educational means, to create an understanding so that discrimination against any minority cannot take root. According to our organization's statement of purpose, we exist to build bridges between different communities. The Canadian Council of Christians and Jews serves as Canada's major sisterhood-brotherhood organization.

Why are we here? Our council does not take political positions and will intervene only if serious questions of

principle are involved. We are here because some of the suggested agendas for constitutional reform deal with vital aspects of Canada's future and require a response from the perspective of equal rights. If handled negatively, the constitutional reform proposals could raise the question of a reversal of 200 years of precedent that have resulted in legal equality for people of all cultures in Canada. Viewed positively, we have an opportunity at this time to examine some of the principles that make our country united and to build on those principles.

Our council has found fertile ground for its mandate in Canada to a degree that appears not to have been possible in any other country in the world. The Canadian council is a larger, better-supported organization than its counterpart in the United States. The International Council of Christians and Jews frequently looks to the Canadian council for leadership. There is no doubt that Canada's advanced policies of respecting the diverse cultural backgrounds of its citizens is the reason the Canadian movement is at the forefront of the other organizations.

Canada has been described as a mosaic rather than a melting pot. At the same time, there can be no doubt that Canada owes at least a part of its distinctiveness to the French fact.

Mr Godfrey: If I may continue, I would like to spend a moment just getting back to first principles. We cannot take our history for granted. Although there have been instances, deplorable instances, of lack of human rights that you heard of in some of the early briefs, our early history has created Canada as a different kind of place. From 1760 onward Canada developed as a different country from those in the old world, in which one culture was superior or a state culture, and other cultures were considered as second-class citizens.

Long before the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms was enacted in 1982, this country was in the forefront of granting equal rights to different cultural groups, developed by precedent over the past two centuries. For example, as early as 1774, the date of the Quebec Act, Catholics in Canada, unlike the Catholic minority in England, were given full civil rights, which applied in Ontario as well. In 1791 Catholics in Upper and Lower Canada were given full political rights by the Constitutional Act and in fact formed majorities in the Legislature of Lower Canada. England, the mother country, did not grant Catholics equal rights until more than a generation later when the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed in 1828.

We were similarly more advanced than the United States. By the time of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, none of the 13 American colonies allowed Catholics equal civil or political rights.

Ontario was at the forefront in other areas as well. It followed Denmark in 1792. Denmark was the first nation to abolish slavery, or to stop the trade in slaves as a step towards abolishing slavery. Upper Canada in 1793 had just been formed and it took steps towards the same effect; much earlier, again, than both England and the United States. The slaves were not finally emancipated until Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. The underground railroad, known to Americans as the secret route to

freedom for those who were escaping slavery, had its terminus north of the American border in Canada. Uncle Tom's Cabin, the place of refuge for runaway slaves, immortalized by Harriet Beecher Stowe, was actually in Dresden, Ontario, and still survives today as a museum, although its continued existence is threatened because of lack of awareness of some of the things we take for granted.

There are other examples of Canada's advanced status in the issue of equal rights. Canadian Jews were given rights to hold high government office by commission in Quebec in the 1760s, long before any similar instances in the United States or in England. Laws were passed in some of the Canadian colonies giving Quakers equal civil and political rights, again long before the same were granted in England. It should be noted that the Legislature of Lower Canada, now part of the province of Quebec, of course, gave equal rights to Quakers at its very first session in 1792.

Although Canada is a young nation, it was one of the first countries in the world to evolve to accept the principle of equality of minority cultural groups, rather than merely tolerating them. It is a new kind of nation. Unfortunately, equality has not yet been perfected. As I said a few moments ago, there have been deplorable instances where different cultural groups have received less than equal treatment—the tax on Chinese immigration, for example, as one of the earlier presenters mentioned. But all such groups have legal equality, and, of course, additional barriers are now in the process of being removed. Canada has evolved as a new kind of country in the world, a country where there is no cultural majority but where a number of different cultures live in mutual respect. Canada is, in a way, a model for the world to come. We are unique. That is why our organization thrives here.

1050

I have to spend another moment on the question of what is a nation, because some of the misunderstandings that have arisen about the direction of the Canadian nation come from the fact that we do not speak the same language, and that the English word "nation" and the French word "nation" do not necessarily have the same meaning in Canada's two official languages. Some dictionaries, for example the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, explain this distinction more clearly.

"Nation" in one sense, in a political sense, can refer to an area that has boundaries, a territorial sense, a political sense, and it may encompass people of different cultures and different peoples, not necessarily a majority of any of those. That is how we think of Canada.

There is another view of "nation." This is an ethnic idea. It is an idea where religion, language and culture are one, where one nation is superior to others. It does not necessarily have to have political boundaries, as in the old days Henri Bourassa used to speak of the French nation as running from coast to coast and the right of people of French culture to have rights from coast to coast in Canada.

But that is changing and what is happening now, this second kind of nation is honing in on boundaries of the province of Quebec, in some cases at the expense of those

of the French nation in the second kind of sense outside of it. In this second kind of nation, people of one cultural group that outnumber the others attempt to make geographic boundaries to enclose themselves. While Canada has been the homeland of all of us, the French Canadian and other cultural groups, French Canadians within the province of Quebec, despite their large minority of other cultural groups within the province, have been developing a concept of distinct geographical entity, and this second kind of nation is now being combined with the first in a way that may create a situation where one group will be the dominant culture and the others will be merely tolerated or second class.

Dr Maivalwala: Compounding the problem is the use of the rhetoric which is designed to achieve political aspirations rather than to state historical facts, thereby making it more difficult to find solutions to national issues. Such a term is "the two founding races." It implies that two groups have a better claim to special status than others but leaves many questions unanswered. According to available information, the two founding races formed no part of Canada's history. "Race" is a term not clearly understood in the Canadian context. There is no relevant "founding" that anyone has indicated. The number of founding races if any, is also open to question.

Canada's founding races have never been clearly defined. Throughout much of its history, Canada had an overwhelming majority of native peoples. Many of the English in the 1750s and 1760s were in fact German Protestants who had come to British North America seeking religious liberty. The town of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia was German-speaking for many years. One recent study has determined that more than 10% of the English in Quebec in 1764 were in fact Jewish.

These statistics do not mean that there should be a revised four- or five-founding-races theory, with each race being entitled to special status. The first official use of the term "two founding races" came not in 1763 or in 1867 but in 1963, when it was used in the wording of the terms of reference of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, suggesting initially that an equal partnership between the two founding races was a fact. The B and C commission reported opposition to this statement at its hearings, but was obliged to proceed regardless of objections to the wording of its actual terms of reference, which had not been open to question in advance by the public. The final report of the commission recommended that Canada should be officially bilingual, which meant that federal government services would be available across Canada in two official languages.

The commission did not make a determination as to whether Canada was made up of two founding races and did not recommend that Canada should be officially bicultural. Instead, in 1971 the federal government announced the adoption of a multicultural policy based on fair play for all. According to this policy, the government "will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups to continue to develop and contribute to Canada, the small and weak groups as well as the strong and highly organized."

Canada's multicultural policy is an acknowledgement that the country is not and was never made up of "two cultures," another example of rhetoric. Possibly the majority of Canada's population is neither of English nor of French culture.

Mr Godfrey: There are continuing examples of the use of rhetoric that make things difficult. I heard a presenter earlier today talk about Canada's three founding races, or he might have said three founding nations, and I understand according to press reports that the same was said at our other hearings previously. I noticed one in Toronto. Last week, one of Ontario's cabinet ministers, in an address to the public, referred to Canada's two founding cultures, thereby giving the term a status denied to it by the British Columbia commission as well as the federal government's multiculturalism policy, and of course by the province of Ontario as well.

The recognition of Quebec as a distinct society in the proposed 1990 constitutional act was to have been the first official recognition in Canadian history of an ethnic nation of the second kind in Canada. Without constitutional restraint or definition, the distinct society could be devoted to preserving and protecting the rights of one culture in Quebec in precedence to those of others.

The majority in the province of Quebec has a great need to know that its culture is not going to be threatened. However, in having the language law enacted three years ago, Premier Bourassa reversed the long-standing rights of other minority cultures in Quebec to express themselves freely on commercial signs and did not appreciate the danger to equality for minorities. This action was out of sync with the tradition of expanding equal rights in Canada and will hopefully be repealed in the future. If Quebec is to have cultural expression for its minority, at the same time its government must ensure that it is the guardian of the rights of all its Canadian citizens, not merely those of the cultural majority in that province.

In the rest of Canada, the same rule must apply. All cultures, including that of French Canadians, must continue to have equal rights of preservation. However, by accepting Quebec as a distinct society, especially with the presence of the "notwithstanding" clause in the Charter of Rights, the precedent is being set for other distinct societies to emerge and create a second or unicultural kind of nation in other provinces and regions as well.

We are one country. We must have one national standard when it comes to freedom and equality. A constructive approach to resolving constitutional dilemmas is not to be found in expanding the number of groups entitled to special status and breaking up the national standard. Rather, the ideal of protecting the rights of all cultures and individuals should be entrenched in the Constitution, providing unequivocally that the protection of group rights is not at the expense of the rights of individuals.

It is our suggestion as an organization of people of goodwill that to do otherwise would be a fundamentally restrictive change in the nature of the rights of Canada's cultural groupings, not in accordance with the traditions of this country. The risk is that today's special status for some could be tomorrow's second-class status for others. In at-

tempting to save Canada as a geographic unity, you must not change the basic philosophy and the ideals of the country so significantly that its *raison d'être*, its tradition of freedom and equality for all cultures, is diminished.

In January 1790, immediately after the French Revolution, one cultural group petitioned the National Assembly of the new French republic. The words of that petition have as much meaning today as they did then:

"The word 'toleration,'" the petition ran, "which, after so many centuries and so many acts of intolerance, appeared to be a word full of humanity and reason, is no longer suitable to a nation that wishes to firmly place its rights upon the eternal foundations of justice. America, to which politics will owe so many useful lessons, has rejected the word from its code as a term tending to compromise individual liberty and to sacrifice certain classes of men to other classes. To tolerate, in fact, is to suffer that which you could, if you wished, prevent and prohibit." Not the same as "equality."

You must not, as our representatives, allow cultural groups in any part of the country to be more than equal or less than equal, or any Canadian to be merely tolerated. To create a "distinct society" in any part of the country could have that effect.

Canada is unique among nations. Its fabric has evolved from modest beginnings. Our history, our freedoms, must not be taken for granted. Canada belongs to all of its citizens and has no classes of citizenship. Equal rights are the birth-right of all of us. The nation of Canada is irreplaceable. It is worth all our efforts to help it grow and flourish. No matter what form constitutional amendment may take or what powers are to be transferred between the federal and provincial governments, the substance of the Constitution must continue to be the rights of each of us to equality throughout the land. That is the reason for Canada's existence. It cannot be compromised.

It is in the nature of politics that political leaders tend to resolve issues by finding consensus among competing interest groups, rather than by leading the public to solutions based on a clear understanding of where we should be going. That tendency will not work this time out. Canada needs politicians who will lead all of us towards an ideal, not find the lowest common denominator among interest groups in order to make a constitutional deal.

You on this committee are in a crucial position to enunciate and clarify what the Canadian nation is. You must help build trust among all cultures so that all the people of Canada can be secure in their historic rights. This may be our last chance to retain the equal status for all that historically has made Canada "the true north strong and free."

1100

Mr Beer: Thank you very much for your presentation. The council always ensures that we have to face the core issue.

I would like to play it back to you, because it seems to me that you really have put your finger on one of the critical issues, which is individual rights as we have come to know them and how we go about, if we should at all, protecting group or collective rights. I guess from a practical

point of view—and the question I would put to you is this—we still have in this country one province in which the language is different from the rest. It is French, and francophone Quebecers see that they have a problem with respect to all of North America and they believe there must be certain protections that are linguistic—but linguistic protections inevitably flow into cultural protections—and that has to be recognized in the Constitution. Now, how do we reflect that kind of day-to-day reality while at the same time reflecting I think all of the principles in your paper, to which I think those of us in Ontario would want to pay full heed? Yet it seems to me that somehow we have to find a way that will honour both of those.

I do not have the answer to that. But would you agree that this is a problem that we have in trying to deal with the current constitutional problem in relation to Quebec? Do you see a way of providing the protection they believe they need, as well as honouring the principles that you have set out in your paper?

Mr Godfrey: The paper is our position, so our answers are personal, of course. If I can respond to that, I think the problem in Quebec is that it moved backwards with respect to individual rights. I do not know whether that answers your question particularly.

They are part of Canada. They have the same principles that we do. Canada is officially bilingual. Quebec is of course unilingual, but it moved backwards with the language law. That is the problem. The direction should be towards expanding rights, and not making them second-class rights but making them equal rights.

Dr Mavalwala: May I just add an addendum, and this is again, as Mr Godfrey has said, a personal response to your question, Charles—Mr Beer.

Mr Beer: Charles.

Dr Mavalwala: It is agreed that there is an enormous connection within the lives of people within their so-called culture, which includes their religion, their language and a whole series of other traditions, and a minor element of that cultural tradition happens to be ethnic food and ethnic dance, as has been pointed out by Mr Dharmalingham. If we are seeking here a solution to the fact that people in this country speak different languages and that a large number of people in Quebec speak one specific language, French, there are other models in the world where governments have dealt with multilingualism. We may not have dealt with multiculturalism as best as we could have, because we have ended up, instead of dealing with multiculturalism, really dealing in somewhat negative ways with multi-ethnicity.

Maybe the question that you are posing here should also make us further think about the dangers of trying to deal with the presence of two languages, or the French-language fact in Canada, and make us a multilingual society, rather than trying to seek solutions such that we end up dividing the country. Not many people want to see the advantages of being multilingual, but the price of being bilingual.

ONTARIO COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA

The Chair: Could I invite next the Ontario Committee of the Communist Party of Canada. Go ahead.

Ms Rowley: Perhaps I could introduce myself first. My name is Elizabeth Rowley and I am the Ontario leader or provincial secretary of the Communist Party.

Before reading the submission that we have prepared today, I would just like to make two brief comments, if I may, based on the opportunity that I had to listen to some of my predecessors in this chair, and those are the following.

First of all, how one would define a nation? It seems to me that it is incumbent upon us to use the language of international law. "Nation" has a specific meaning whereas "distinct society" has no meaning whatsoever which is one of the reasons I think that it was quite proper that the Meech Lake accord failed, because it had no meaning in terms of any recognition of the right of Quebec to self-determination.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset, and on behalf of the Ontario committee of the Communist Party, I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to speak to the crucial question of how to redress the unequal union of English-speaking Canada, Quebec and the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

This is the burning issue that has alternately flared and smoldered ever since the defeat of the French by the British in Quebec over 200 years ago. The origins of the coercive and oppressive relationship between English-speaking Canada and Quebec are in a military defeat. They are the relations of victor over vanquished.

Though two centuries have passed, the fundamental nature of this relationship has not changed significantly despite considerable effort to camouflage it with the Trudeau policy of bilingualism and biculturalism, and more recently with the "distinct society" clause in the failed Meech Lake accord.

Even as recently as 1970, Quebec was occupied by federal troops under the War Measures Act to "apprehend an insurrection."

Never a marriage of equality, nor a partnership arrived at voluntarily, the British North America Act and Confederation of 1867 were instruments designed to permanently entrench Quebec's unequal and subjugated union to English speaking Canada within the context of a strong and centralized Canadian state.

Even today it is not democracy that motivates the federal government in this once more burning debate on the future of Canada and on the relationship between English-speaking Canada and Quebec. The Tories' interest is not in Canada, but in continental integration, in maximized profits, where "Canada is merely a motley collection of provinces unified only by the private sector, and that the weakest among us must look after themselves."

Similarly, the history of Canada's aboriginal peoples is one of subjugation and genocide. As statistics given in the select committee's discussion paper show, the social and economic conditions forced on to Canada's aboriginal peoples are so shockingly far below the national average that the United Nations is now actively interested in the condition,

and the wellbeing of the aboriginal peoples of Canada. The conditions inflicted on aboriginal peoples are the result of systematic policy of genocide which has been pursued for hundreds of years by both Liberal and Conservative governments and their predecessors in all parts of Canada.

The entire history of Canada shows that in order to achieve genuine Canadian unity—that is, an equal and voluntary partnership of each of Canada's nations in a new confederal pact—there must be a sharp break with the past and, we can say, with the present.

110

Unity that is predicated on force, coercion and inequality is anathema to the democratic aspirations of peoples everywhere and in particular to those united by such bonds.

In such conditions, furthermore, democracy and the democratic rights of all are in jeopardy, as the proclamation of the War Measures Act in 1970 explicitly showed. The War Measures Act eliminated the right of habeas corpus, the right of due process and other fundamental and democratic rights of all Canadians irrespective of guilt or innocence.

This is the case in Northern Ireland, in the Middle East and in South Africa, where a virtual state of war and occupation has existed for years. This is the result of national oppression, combined in South Africa with institutionalized racism, apartheid.

This is also true in other countries, in fact increasingly so, as global restructuring, a result of the scientific and technological revolution in the productive forces, rapidly and profoundly affects relations between nations and states and between national and international bodies, including multinational corporations. Indeed, the urgent demand of the newly developing countries—as distinct, by the way, from Mr Bush's demand for a new international economic order—is based on the growing inequities and disparities between nations and states, which like the Third World debt are a threat to democracy, to peace and to the wellbeing of all nations.

It is also true in Canada. Unless Canadians are prepared to eschew democracy, and once again let matters be settled with tanks, in Quebec or in Oka or perhaps somewhere closer, the only democratic solution is to recognize that Canada is a multinational state and constitutionally guarantee the right of each nation, that is, of English-speaking Canada, of Quebec and of the aboriginal peoples of Canada, to self-determination up to and including secession, and that is a term which is understood in international law.

In other words, a voluntary equal partnership of nations in one state is only possible if each is guaranteed the right to determine for itself the form of sovereignty it will exercise. Secession or separation is only one form in which sovereignty, that is, self-determination, can be exercised. Sovereignty can also be exercised within a confederal arrangement, provided that the mechanisms are created to guarantee genuine equality among the partners, including in the first place mechanisms which can guarantee the exercise of the right to secession.

As in a marriage, we can say, the right to secession, that is, the right to a divorce, the right to leave, which must

include the legal mechanisms for exercising that right, is also at the same time the best guarantee for a continued voluntary partnership.

Legislative mechanisms might include, for example, two legislative chambers, one of which would be comprised of equal representation from each nation and one of which would be comprised geographically by population across the country, such as the House of Commons which presently exists. To become law, legislation would have to pass through both chambers.

The Communist Party of Canada has fought for recognition of Canada's multinational character and for the right of nations to self-determination up to and including the right to secede for almost 70 years. We will continue to fight for a democratic solution to the national question in Canada, while continuing to fight for Canadian independence, for peace, for jobs and for an end to the neo-conservative Mulroney government which has done more to divide and balkanize Canada along regional, national, religious, economic, social, sexual, racial and cultural lines than virtually any previous government in Canadian history.

If for no other reason than to stop the sellout of Canada, to safeguard and strengthen democracy, English-speaking Canada, and Ontario in the first place, must reach out with a new approach to Canadian unity and with a new understanding of the national question in Canada.

In Ontario, it means that the government must undertake as an urgent priority a mass, province-wide educational program designed to inform and educate Ontarians about the national rights of Franco-Ontarians, as a national minority living in English-speaking Canada, with rights to education and services in the French language wherever numbers warrant; and of aboriginal peoples to education and services in their languages wherever numbers warrant, as well as to affirmative action programs to raise living standards rapidly and across the board.

It means that the democratic rights of ethnic minorities to protect their heritage, language and culture and to pass it on to their children and grandchildren must also be protected through special after-school programs in schools and community centres, through funding for cultural and heritage programs.

The widely held idea, which is also pushed by right-wing fringe groups like the Confederation of Regions that this is either a question of unwarranted privilege for francophones or a form of compulsion or coercion on English-speaking Ontarians needs to be immediately addressed from the point of view of the national rights of the francophone minority in Ontario. Nothing less will do.

The government must also utilize such a campaign to expose and uproot the bigotry and racism that is growing at an alarming rate, particularly in northern Ontario, against both the aboriginal peoples and francophones. This means legislation banning groups like the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada—and its president Ronald Leitch—which is openly fanning the flames of bigotry, racism and chauvinism, which has contravened the Criminal Code's hate laws and which is almost singlehandedly responsible for the backlash against the provision of provincial

services in French in designated municipalities. Everyone remembers that last year, I think.

The government should also act to immediately remove the racist professor, Philip Rushton, at the University of Western Ontario, who is funded by neo-Nazi groups in the United States and who even former Premier David Peterson recognized as a real scourge.

Further, the government should take steps to delink the funding of separate schools through grade 13 in Ontario with the issue of French-language schools for francophones in Ontario. These latter are not religious schools. They have no connection to the separate school board. To the contrary, they are administered by public boards of education elected by French-speaking public school supporters.

In fact, Bill 30 should be rescinded because, as is the case in Essex county most recently, the bill has the effect of splitting desperately needed funds for education. It splits school buildings, it splits kids and it splits communities along narrow religious and national lines. Instead of Bill 30, Ontario needs funds for French-language education, for schools, for a college and for a university, which is a right that should be met.

Of course the national question is not a provincial issue, though the effort of some to box it that way is confusing to many. Ontario's willingness to speak up and to point out that Quebec is a nation, not a province, and to ensure that the national rights of the francophone minority in Ontario and the rights of the aboriginal peoples are protected are important steps. We urge that they be taken now.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation.

MARTIN SILVA

The Chair: We have another insertion into the agenda at this point. I just note for the members of the committee that the Alliance of Portuguese Clubs and Associations scheduled for later will not be appearing, but one of the members from that group would like to speak to us briefly, Martin Silva, councillor of the city of Toronto, and then there is another addition to the agenda following that.

1120

Mr Silva: I arrived in Canada on 11 August 1968. I voted for the first time in a provincial election in September 1973. I had acquired the right to vote in my adoptive country even before the country where I was born had given its citizens the right to vote. Since then, every time that I go and exercise the right that was given to me in my adoptive country, it has become a very emotional experience for me.

In 1985, I ran for elected office for the first time and was elected separate school representative on the public school board in the city of Toronto. My adoptive country had not only given me the right to vote but also allowed me to participate in the political and decision-making process.

Friends of mine who chose other countries in the world to live tell me how those countries treat their imported workers. When I tell them of the opportunities here and how anybody arriving in Canada can the next day find a job, buy a house, start a business, acquire citizenship in three years and then vote, run for office and become part of the government, they cannot believe it.

That is what makes this country unique, the capacity to treat every human being as an equal and to allow all races and creeds to live together in harmony. I know that we still have a way to go but we certainly are further ahead than many other countries in the world. We have to preserve this uniqueness. Furthermore, we have to make it more inclusive.

There is one group of citizens who were here before all of us immigrants arrived and who have not been given the same opportunity. Because of historical factors that preceded us all in this room, they were put away in reservation and their rights and opportunities severely curtailed.

When the first white men arrived on the shores of this nation, they brought with them a philosophy of conquest and domination that was prevalent at the time. They had superior technology, and we all know that superior technology makes for very uneven wars. The native people lost the war, and since then there was no United Nations to liberate them, they have been treated as vanquished ever since.

We now must rise above the historical context that chains us and we must redress that situation. We must extend to the aboriginal peoples the same opportunities that are granted to all the other individuals who arrive from every other nation and are welcomed into this country.

I am not a constitutional expert to be able to suggest the way to do this, but it must be done. Many times in the past, the main arguments against extending certain rights to minorities have been those of a financial priority. Those arguments, much as the philosophy of conquest and domination prevalent at the time of the arrival of the British and the French, must be overcome. No one in today's Canada reality would suggest that education, health and housing should not be extended to every individual in every corner of this province just because it would cost a lot of money.

We must find the same will, financial and political, to extend to the aboriginal peoples the same opportunities enjoyed by the descendants of the two conquering nation and by the members of every other nation that has arrived in the meantime.

We must ensure, in order for our civilization to attain the next level of development, that our minority aboriginal population is not denied anywhere in the province the opportunity to get a decent education, find a job, buy a house, start a business, vote and run for office. And we must go further. We must educate the other cultures, both the prevalent and the minority, to accept and enforce that right, because a right given to a group in a minority is useless, if the majority is not willing to recognize and enforce that right.

In conclusion, Mr Chairman, I would like to extend to you and your committee the best wishes for what is a difficult job, but at the same time an opportunity, what we can call a once in a history time opportunity, to do what no one has been able to do before in correcting a most grievous wrong perpetrated upon our aboriginal peoples. May the Great Spirit illuminate your deliberations and guide you to a most satisfying solution.

Mr G. Wilson: It is a fascinating account, Mr Silva, and also the recommendations you make, but I was wondering

your experience, how do you account for your recent arrival, say, and your success in getting your present position? What is different? Support in the community, for instance, or your own initiative, or what would you put it down to?

Mr Silva: Well, it has run in the family. When my father used to visit, he used to compare himself to the doctor of the village and say: "The fact that I went to Canada made me just like the doctor in the village. I have a house, I have a car, I have a television." He measured his progress in life by the material possessions that he had been able to acquire by coming to Canada and being able to work and earn a living.

In my case, I must say, and I am sure that MPP Marilyn Churley would agree, that being white, male and able to speak English have been quite helpful in my achieving what I have achieved. But I must admit that part of it is also due to the way that this country has evolved. Even when the minority is only an audible minority—you can only notice that I was not born here when I speak, through my accent—on the whole, minorities in Canada are better treated and better accepted than they are anywhere else in the world. For that, we are thankful.

As I said, we still have some more wrongs that need to be corrected and I am sure that here in Ontario we are in a position to take the leadership in addressing those wrongs and making Ontario the perfect society to live in.

Ms Churley: I just want to welcome my ex-colleague from city hall.

Mr Silva: We miss you.

Ms Churley: Do you? We will talk about that later. I miss you too.

Your presentation was very interesting, and I would just like to thank you for coming down and sharing that with us. I do not have a question. I just wanted to specifically welcome you.

Mr Silva: Anything to get away from the city hall.

Mr Bisson: I have a very quick question. We have been hearing a lot from people across the province, and probably more so since this last week, about how people see a vision of Canada as developing in the direction of one language, one culture, one flag, one everything, and everything the same and that way it will be all unified. As a citizen of this country, how does that make you feel and what do you think that will bring if we were to go that path?

Mr Silva: I think it would be wrong. For example, I speak English at home, yet my son goes to Portuguese school at night and learns Portuguese. I am originally from Portugal. That gives him the opportunity to go back and visit his grandparents and communicate with his grandparents as if they are still part of the family. Had we evolved in the route of going towards one language, my son would have lost part of his family and would not be able to communicate with his grandparents.

I have the opportunity to travel in various countries and I always manage to get along, whether it is with my poor Spanish or with my Portuguese or with the rudimentary French that I speak or with the accented English. Having more languages is not something that occupies a place in

my mind; it is something that just makes me more functional. I think that in today's world, when international communications make it possible for, for example, television programs to enter our homes in just about every language that is spoken in the globe, a country that has many languages will be able to survive in the international community.

This is from a macro vision of the country as a country that will be able to communicate with any other country through its own citizens. But for individuals I think that sometimes, for example, when I go to Quebec, there are certain words that have no translation in English simply because they have a specific meaning in French. If we manage to preserve that respect for people who speak other languages, we will be able then to increase that to having the same respect for people who are of different colours and of different cultures and we may become, at one point in time, perfectly free of any racist feelings that sometimes human beings are prone to harbour unfortunately.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Silva.

1130

ABORIGINAL URBAN ALLIANCE OF ONTARIO

The Chair: I call next Andy Rickard from the Aboriginal Urban Alliance of Ontario.

Mr Rickard: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank the committee for giving me the opportunity to make a brief presentation here. As you might recall, I gave you my own language presentation in Timmins when we joined there last 11 February. I did that not to be what you would call a smart-ass or anything but to demonstrate to you that there are more languages than French and English in this country, and I think I have been successful in doing that. Because you do not have the technical facility to translate my language, I will speak to you in English so it will be a lot easier for all of us.

I represent the Aboriginal Urban Alliance of Ontario today from a different perspective altogether. In order for us to deal with the constitutional challenges, we also have to equate it with economic strengths and considerations. I am paraphrasing my presentation, because I am trying to save time as much as I can. As a Canadian of aboriginal ancestry, I believe that until we resolve the questions of the constitutional framework and the economic stability of this country, it is almost impossible to deal with our own issues that we often call aboriginal issues.

We also have to relate in terms of regional disparities, even within this province. When you look at me, you probably think: "This guy is going to talk about aboriginal rights. He wants his land back and all that." As I told you in Timmins, we do not want our land back. It is a hell of a mess right now. I want to cheer you up, because you look so serious. Relax, take it easy. It might have been boring for the last few weeks, but I hope your conclusion this week will be conducive to a good consultation involving as many Ontarians as possible.

The Chair: It has been anything but boring, Mr Rickard.

Mr Rickard: There are four areas I would like to articulate on by raising questions rather than making recommendations. Some of the people here know that northern Ontario is further north than Bloor and Yonge streets; I came to that conclusion after 10 years of travelling through this province. I also know that the power structure of this government is centred right here, where we are right now. Being a student of politics, like many of you inside here as well as outside, I have got accustomed to watching the various regimes operate here, from the Conservatives—you have heard of those guys. That was supposed to be a joke, by the way.

Mr Eves: Some of us are still alive.

Mr Harnick: Thanks.

Mr Rickard: The Liberals, of course, came on stream, and we now have the NDP government. When I say there are disparities, I speak not so much as an aboriginal person but as an individual who lives in northern Ontario who happens to be an aboriginal person. When I refer to economic strategies or something to that effect, I am not talking necessarily of transfer of ministries to the various parts of the province, which is a good idea, I suppose. I am also not talking about financial bail-outs or tax breaks for various corporations or companies throughout this province. I am talking about more energetic, fundamental considerations, which I will address in the form of questions.

For example, in northern Ontario it is said that in 1981 about 163,000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 lived there. Five years later, there was an indication of a net loss of 25,000 in this same age category. That is about a 15% net loss, or brain drain, as I call it. What kind of strategies will this province undertake to deal with this serious situation?

I would also like to address a point of some of the areas I come from. For example, in the area of Timiskaming between Matheson, Kirkland Lake, Tri-town and Temagami, we have an unemployment rate of 30%. As we well know, the national 9% or 10% unemployment rate brings out crisis proportions to every person in this country. I have often wondered why this should happen in this great province of opportunity. For example, look at the people of Kirkland Lake and area. It is dividing the community, because the only immediate opportunity we have to consider, which has an environmental aspect, is the garbage. Your garbage is our economic opportunity. Surely there have to be people here with the capacity—when I say people, I am talking about people being put in government here as well as federal—to develop some strategies of economic stability. Surely that cannot be that difficult.

I also would like to point out that although I may deviate from the constitutional aspect of leadership, there is an economic issue that has to be balanced in relation to the overall framework of a good strategy. So I ask, what is Queen's Park going to do about a lot of these areas? What is Canada going to do?

In terms of diverse provincial transportation facilities, the high cost of living, I often wonder, as a northern Ontarian, why we have to put up with this. Why should beer, liquor and wine be the only commodities that are the same price

here in Toronto as they are in Port Severn? Those are the challenges. There has to be a more balanced price system, a good structural price system for this province.

I also want to refer very briefly to the misconception of the French and English as the founding nations of the country. We continuously hear this. Somebody said we lost the war. We did not. We have not yet begun to fight for socioeconomic and legal equality. Our people, under section 91, class of subject 24, and section 35 respectively, of the Constitution Acts, are the only identifiable racial group in the Constitution. Hence, the only logical sequence to the process is that we should be recognized in our Constitution as a founding, distinct nation as well, because we have no memory of where we come from, although I jokingly say sometimes that we skated across the Bering Strait on our way back from China. That is supposed to be humorous again, so relax.

Therefore, when I look at the next point, nation-building in 30 minutes—I do not say that to be facetious. How can you build a nation in 30 minutes? Maybe this is a miraculous event unfolding in this particular area. After this show is over today, or this week, what happens in the process? When will we get involved again? The next federal election, the next provincial election four years down the road? Whatever the result, in my opinion it will be a long time before I come before you again to indicate what my wishes are in terms of constitutional changes.

As far as the report of this committee is concerned, what happens to your findings? How do you compile the various complex, perhaps, presentations you have heard for delivery? Who will deliver the message? The committee, the whole Legislature, the Premier, the cabinet?

The other thing I also wanted to consider: The next time a group of men gets together in a back room to try to develop their own conception of national unity, I think there have to be some considerations thought of. For example, women, youth, and other real Canadians should be involved in the process to reflect reality and common sense for national reconciliation or nation-building, direct participation on their part.

We hear there was a meeting of minds. I believe the first criterion for a meeting of minds is that you have to be qualified to participate in that process. I do not say that to be facetious, again. I want to reflect that a lot of Canadian in this country can have very intelligent input into the process of constitutional strength and the development of this country.

1140

I say as well that there should be no more closed-door meetings ever held to decide on national issues without involvement of community-based Canadians.

Finally, I only have time to make one recommendation. For the sake of continuity, for the sake of genuine involvement and consultation, I suggest that you recommend to your Premier and cabinet that a less formal, quasi-formal Ontario in Confederation body be set up to continue soliciting the views of Ontarians and other people and to represent the diverse characteristics of this province from the private sector, public sector and the various other multicultural elements of this province. That is the only way we are

ing to have any significant input. If we do not have that, I am afraid this involvement becomes almost totally meaningless in the sense of substance, the development and implementation of the rebuilding of Canada.

All Ontarians must be involved. That is the bottom line, I believe. The demands and challenges required in nation-building are too important to be left to politicians, to be left to bureaucrats, to be left to lawyers—although I respect lawyers. My friend behind here is a good lawyer; he is an exception.

I would just like to leave you with one message, and this reflects the cultural aspects of my people. Somebody borrowed it along the way. It simply states: "Do not follow me; I may not lead. Do not try to lead me, for I may not follow. But I want you to walk beside me and be my friend." That way, we will ultimately reach that—I do not say Utopia—level of coexistence that will be healthy in this country.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you very much for being part of this. God bless each and every one of you. May your conclusions come to a very beneficial effect for all people. Thank you for hearing me out.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Rickard. There is one question, if you will hold on for a second, but let me just say to you that we are very conscious of the need, as you pointed out, for the discussion to continue. We have never presumed that even with the extensive hearings we have held we would be able to find all of the solutions in this process, and we will be looking at ways in which we can continue the discussion in the weeks and months to come.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think you have many unique aspects to your presentation. First of all, I think you are the only person who has come before us twice. I did not think I would see you again when you said that in Timmins; I thought you were fooling that night.

Second, I think you are the first man who has mentioned that more women need to be involved. If you have been following the hearings, you likely have seen that the native women have been presenting some very poignant briefs to us, some very direct challenges, as you have done this morning. So you within your own communities must be providing some very strong opportunities for leadership, and we have seen that right across the province, whether in Cornwall, Sudbury, Thunder Bay.

I also want to thank you from the bottom of my heart, because the native community is the only community that has prayed for us, at least openly, in our presence and have told us they are praying for us. I think that is significant.

I want to say one other thing. When you challenged the select committee to continue, you may remember that in the last Legislature in 1987, a select committee on education was created. That committee became, really, almost a standing committee because its mandate was renewed on four different occasions. I had the privilege of serving on it for the entire time of three and a half years. So that is very possible this time. You are the first person who has suggested that such an event may come again. If you could—and you must have done some intent thinking—can you name the first three items you would want to see on the

agenda if we ever achieve such a thing as an Ontario in Confederation council?

Mr Rickard: I believe that royal commissions, committees, have a tendency to exist on their own by the fact that it is something unclear in terms of dealing with issues or challenges. My perception of this particular structure would be sort of a sunset involvement on specific matters, for example, how all the special considerations may be molded into a provincial strategy from Ontario in furtherance of the ongoing constitutional discussions. In other words, you would have more than just your cabinet or your party—I do not know what party you are from; it does not say here.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am from the Liberal Party.

Mr Rickard: Okay. That you will have a recourse of accessing not only special interest groups but the variety of all the collective groups in this province. Exactly how that would be set up would take me more than I can justly answer.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I understand what you are saying.

Mr Rickard: However, if you have any connection at Queen's Park, I would be glad to provide a strategy for you.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So that would be certainly one of the items on the agenda that you would like us first to consider, how we can continue involvement of people in a real systematic way.

Mr Rickard: Thank you.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I thank you so much for your challenges and for your prayers and thoughtful presentation.

ONTARIO METIS AND ABORIGINAL ASSOCIATION

The Chair: I call next from the Ontario Metis and Aboriginal Association, Olaf Bjornaa, Chris Reid and Henry Wetelainen.

Mr Reid: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Chris Reid. I am the self-government co-ordinator for OMAA. On my immediate right is Olaf Bjornaa, OMAA's president, and on my far right is Henry Wetelainen, OMAA's first vice-president. I am going to say a few introductory remarks and turn it over to Olaf, and then I will make a few concluding remarks.

I want to say at the beginning that we were under the impression until we came today that we would have half an hour, and we see on the agenda that we have been asked to speak for only 15 minutes, so we will try to keep within the time frame.

We have left with the clerk a copy of our presentation called OMAA's Forgotten People. We are not going to read from the presentation. We will leave that with you and we will try to highlight the main points in it.

As Olaf will elaborate on in a minute, OMAA is an umbrella organization of off-reserve native communities in Ontario. Our constituents are both Metis and Indian. Some people, in fact, are both, because we do not accept the Indian Act definition of who our people are. A person may be a registered Indian under the Indian Act and nevertheless be a Metis and vice versa.

Our people have existed as self-governing communities since long before Canada and Ontario had a Constitution. That goes as well for our Metis communities as for our Indian communities.

Since roughly the mid-1700s there have been self-governing Metis communities in Ontario. These have been joined over the years by Indians who have been forced off reserves through the effects of the Indian Act, through the denial of status under the Indian Act, and through economic necessity and through the effects of the residential schools.

At this point in our history, there are 250,000 aboriginal people in Ontario. Of these 250,000 about 50,000 live on reserves. Those 50,000 are represented by the band councils registered under the Indian Act. The other 200,000 aboriginal people, of whom about 160,000 are Metis and non-status Indians by self-identification, are not represented by these band councils. In fact, they cannot be because the Indian Act specifically forbids off-reserve Indians and Metis from participating in band politics. Section 77 specifically says that only Indians ordinarily resident on a reserve may run or vote in band elections, so the other 200,000 aboriginal people are not represented by band councils.

Unfortunately, the policy up to today and still today of both the federal government and the government of Ontario is to all but refuse to recognize off-reserve aboriginal peoples. When the provincial government deals with aboriginal affairs, 99% of the time it deals with band councils. This is easy, it is convenient, because the federal government recognizes some constitutional responsibility for dealing with band councils. The federal government unconstitutionally denies its obligation to deliver services for off-reserve aboriginal people or to pay for those services.

1150

The province could respond in one of three ways to that federal government approach, which has been consistent for the last 100 years. One option would be to resist that and try to force the federal government, through whatever means it can, to acknowledge its responsibility to all aboriginal peoples.

A second alternative would be to acknowledge a provincial responsibility, let the feds get away with off-loading their responsibilities and pick up the responsibility for negotiating with off-reserve aboriginal people and delivering quality services to our people.

The third option is to do nothing, to simply use the federal off-loading as an excuse to say: "This matter is too complicated. It is too big. We cannot do anything." Unfortunately that has been Ontario's position and it still is today.

There are many options available to us, but unfortunately, up to now the province has chosen to find ways not to deal with us instead of finding ways to deal with us.

The policy of Ontario, despite all the denials, and the policy of the federal government is still assimilation. Nobody will say that explicitly any more. Nobody will come out and say that the policy is to assimilate aboriginal people into non-aboriginal society, but in practice that is what it is.

You can name any issue, any sector of our society, any sector of government policy, be it justice, child welfare,

education, any matter whatsoever, and there is absolutely no place for our people in this society.

There is no recognition of our right to have any role in deciding how our children are educated, no recognition at all of any right to decide how our children are cared for in the children's aid society system, no recognition at all for role for off-reserve aboriginal people in the justice system. I could go on and on. It is the same in every respect.

Even in Natural Resources, the unique and special relationship of aboriginal peoples to the land is denied in practice. Again, you will not find a politician saying that. The will all say, "No, assimilation is not the policy," but in practice it is.

The results are clear. The Metis language, for example called Michif, is dead in Ontario. It has been extinct for decades now and it may not be revivable. The Indian languages of off-reserve aboriginal communities are quickly dying.

When we try to address this issue with the Ministry of Education, we are told: "Well, we have pilot projects. We are dealing with some band councils. Maybe when those are finished, we will talk to you." So we cannot even get negotiations going at this point to try to protect and preserve our cultures.

In this respect, again, it is simply a concrete example of the assimilation policies which continue today.

I am going to at this point ask Olaf to tell you a little bit more about OMAA and then I will try to add some suggestions for further work that we can undertake.

Mr Bjornaa: OMAA was founded in 1971 or in 1972. The reason why it was formed was because we know the Constitution of Canada has been a burden to our people. Specifically, we have not been a burden to the Constitution; the Constitution has been a burden to all our people.

Education, jobs, you name it, our economic development, have been taken away from us. What have we got left? So I want you to know around this table here that the Constitution that has been here has been a burden to our people, all our children, and it is still here. Until you realize and straighten this up that we are a distinct people here, we are not leaving. We have been pushed as far as we can be pushed. Now is our time to get up and speak, which we have been doing.

Each time we seem to come out and speak on our rights and stuff, we seem to be called radicals, you name it. We did not take anything from your society. You took from us. You took our children's rights away, adopted them out, took their homeland away from them. You took their native culture away from them. What more can you take away from them?

I really feel if you cannot change this Constitution and look at us as native people, there is nothing here at this table. OMAA has taken form as a united group, a very strong group. We are doers. We went out and accomplished the impossible things that you left us to do. A lot of our children we worked hard to put through school to better them. This Constitution of Canada did not do it for us, we did it.

Our grandchildren: Even yet today I have my grandchildren ask me who they are. What is their culture? I have two cultures. My father was white; my mother was native. What am I going to teach these grandchildren? This Constitution and this government must stop and look and say, Look, we are not leaving; we are here."

OMAA is broken up into five regions. In the five regions we have presidents, boards of directors, that are out here trying to explain to our children and our grandchildren to come, "There is something here in this land for you."

Welfare cheques we do not want. We have always had pride. All we are asking this government to do is give us our pride. We are not asking to become cultured people. We have been here. This is our culture. They found ways to put out millions of dollars for different cultures. We are here. We are not leaving. If we leave here, what are we going to call home? There is no place for home but here in Canada.

Really, I am very disappointed to talk to my children and my grandchildren and say, "This is Canada, our proud homeland." What have they got to be proud of?

OMAA now has brought some things to our people, some pride. We have worked hard at it, very hard. Every hurdle we have had, we have had to climb a hill. Each time we seem to get to the top of this hill, there is something to push us down: "We are sorry. The Constitution says you cannot do this." "We are sorry. There are not funds here for you." But yet we see big companies that we know are going bankrupt and the government comes in and bails them out for how many millions of dollars.

This child here, if it had a good education, had a good homeland here we could be proud of, then we are doing something here. I could look back and say that I am proud of the government that is here. My mother went to a residential school. The stories she told me were not very good.

I really believe that around this table people sleep good. Every day this Constitution, the way it sits, has been a burden. It has been a burden to me, my children, my grandchildren and theirs to come. Until they can do something to change this and make this thing better, what have we got here?

I could go on here all day, but we have not got the time. Really, 15 minutes is not very much time to talk about your life for your people.

We are here. We are not leaving and we are not a burden on you. That is one thing I want—around this table here, we are doers and we are going to keep on and we are not leaving.

Perhaps Henry would like to have a few words.

Mr Wetelainen: I guess the point that we are trying to make is that our communities, which are spread across this province, are mixed. We are mixed bloods a lot of us. We are proud of our white heritage, but we are also proud of our native heritage.

We have a unique view of this country. We have a unique view that we were the first ones to respect the other races. We intermarried constantly. Our roots are deeply entrenched with the land and a respect for the land and we think, as caretakers of that land, we shared it with the

dominant society. The dominant society has neglected that land and its joint sharing.

What we are trying to say to you is that the communities that we represent definitely want to work in a partnership. We want to sit down and discuss it with you as equals. We want to sit down with the French people and discuss it as equals.

When the referendum in Sault Ste Marie was passed, it hurt us too. It hurt us deeply because we knew that if a society as large as the French community can be put down, so can we. We have known it for years.

Our languages have been destroyed. The federal government has systematically destroyed our culture. One of the proudest moments I have ever had was when we had a traditional powwow back on our reserve and there were Metis and non-status communities. The people who brought the flag of that nation out were non-status living off the reserve. We have kept our culture alive. It is something you cannot take from us.

1200

We have put the challenge forward that we are willing to work. We have a complex problem. As Mr Rickard said before, the process must continue; it cannot be a 15-minute session jammed between a number of other presentations. We are a founding people. We are the people here waiting, and we must work out a process.

Your government has made numerous commitments to us as aboriginal people and we are throwing that challenge back to you now. We have speeches upon speeches of commitments made to our people. We came from a self-government discussion in another building down at the Metropolitan Toronto Convention Centre just a few minutes ago, and government of Ontario officials were still standing up there trying to figure out what position they are putting forward today. It was not good to see that. We do not think there is a commitment yet from this government. Your commitment that you give us over the years has not been translated down. We are still talking to those walls. We are not being listened to.

We have put position papers upon position papers in front of your governments, successive governments, the Conservatives before that, the Liberals and now the NDP. We are just asking to be heard; we are asking that you listen to our viewpoints. We cannot tell you in 15 minutes what they are, but those papers are there and those positions are there and we are expecting that we will be treated as equals.

Mr Reid: As you can see by now, we are not proposing any specific amendments to the Canadian Constitution. We do not think that is in fact even necessary; it might be nice. We would be thrilled if Canada and Ontario would simply obey the law as it is now.

The law of Canada now, the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, has a section called section 35. There is a Supreme Court of Canada decision, the Sparrow decision, from last year which dealt with that section. We would be thrilled if Ontario simply understood, even without Canada, to implement section 35 along the lines of the Supreme Court of Canada's reasons in the Sparrow case.

It should shock people that we are by no means certain that will happen at all. There are plenty of court decisions, Supreme Court decisions that are ignored by both governments now which could be implemented. The Canadian government has consistently violated the Constitution even while it talks about one law for all and aboriginal people have to be subject to the same law as everybody else. They conveniently ignore the supreme law of the land, their Constitution.

We have proposed specific ways of doing that, as Henry said. We filed with the clerk this morning, in addition to our paper called Ontario's Forgotten People, a copy of a discussion paper drafted by staff of the Ontario native affairs secretariat. It sets out accurately one of OMAA's proposals for establishing a process to implement our people's right of self-government.

It is very simple. We have proposed a simple, streamlined process called an aboriginal claims commission which would facilitate the negotiation of claims by offers of aboriginal peoples based on their rights. It would be an inexpensive system and we think relatively quick. We are agreeable, for example, to submitting through this system to arbitration. If Ontario was really interested in justice, we think it would as well. Arbitration is only one option. Mediation is another. We prefer negotiations. We have consistently been asking for negotiations, as Henry and Olaf said.

There are several other options available to implement our aboriginal and treaty rights. The Constitution contains many amendment formulas, many ways of implementing amendments which could flesh out or detail what section 35 means. We do not expect the federal government to take the lead in this matter. They have in fact said that they will not. Ontario could. Ontario could call a conference on aboriginal constitutional reform, invite the representatives of aboriginal peoples and invite the other provinces as well. This could lead to an amendment to the Canadian Constitution, if it is felt that is necessary, using the section 38 process.

Alternatively we could investigate an amendment to the Constitution under section 43. This is a constitutional amendment which affects only one province. Using section 43, the federal and the provincial government could do that together with the aboriginal peoples without the other provinces involved. There is no reason why that cannot be done. Ontario could amend its own Constitution under section 35.

We are willing to work under any of these options. As Henry said, we have tabled—I cannot count the number of options, the number of proposals that we have given Ontario to negotiate with us and up to now all we have got are excuses as to why it cannot be done. We realize that there are difficulties with any negotiations process, but all we are asking for is a genuine commitment to find solutions. As we said, why not submit the outstanding issues that we think are difficulties to an arbitrator? We will agree to that, and start with a mediator, even, if you are not happy, with arbitration; then go to arbitration. We realize there are risks in that for us, but we feel we have got nothing to lose. Up to this point, absolutely nothing has happened but talk.

I do not think we have to say any more than that. We cannot say much more than that without getting into detail on any one specific point. We wanted to give you an overview of our position.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation. Let me just say, before we move on to the next group, that as I said earlier, I think we are quite conscious and we do not for a minute presume that we are going to be able to resolve all of the outstanding issues in the short time frame that we have, but I think that you very clearly put before us the main thrusts of what we need to do and, I think, the details we obviously need to pursue and that need to be addressed.

I know that native peoples have received commitment after commitment, and I think we are all conscious of that and we are conscious that it is going to take a lot more than just continuing good words to deal with these problems. Certainly in our hearings across the province we have heard a great deal of support for continuing to deal, or maybe even in some ways beginning to deal, with the issues and the injustices that have been perpetuated against native peoples.

I think that we can take heart that not only native people but non-natives have come before this committee and very clearly said to us that this is an area we need to focus a lot of attention on. I hope that will also assist us all in being able to move to rendering some form of justice there. We obviously know that the discussions need to continue, as I said earlier we will do our best to ensure that they continue.

Mr Wetelainen: I guess one thing we would like to do is thank the people who have come forward with the support, from the non-aboriginal community. We respect that and we think the support is there and is very strong across this province. We have had a lot of misunderstanding in the past and I think now is the time that we start to sit down and negotiate those things, and we thank them for their support.

The Chair: Absolutely; thank you.

Mr Bjornaa: I think one other thing is that Bob Reid has made some strong commitments towards native people. We are proud to hear that and we want to thank them for at least looking at us and seeing what we can do.

Mr Reid: Thank you, as well, and keep in mind one thing. I notice that Harry Laforme and Kim Fullerton are here from the Indian Commission of Ontario (Aboriginal Peoples), and I suppose they will be talking to you later. I just wanted to be sure that you understand that this is an example of a forum our people do not have access to. It is only the registered bands that have access to any of the existing processes for claims negotiations. What we have proposed is an alternative for our people.

The Chair: Could I call next representatives from the Arab Women's Network? Is there no one here from the Arab Women's Network? All right, we will go on and come back to them. From the Ad Hoc Committee on Women and the Constitution—

Ms McGraw: They are just coming. Could the Indian Commission of Ontario here go ahead of them?

The Chair: Well, I was told to put them down later, which was why I have skipped over them.

Ms McGraw: Yes, I understand that.

The Chair: I would be quite happy to invite the people from the Indian Commission of Ontario to come forward.

Ms McGraw: I am sorry, but would it be possible just to switch those two?

The Chair: I am sorry. Whom should I be calling next?

Ms McGraw: Perhaps it could be the Indian Commission of Ontario and the Ad Hoc Committee of Women will represent after them.

The Chair: That is fine; yes.

210

INDIAN COMMISSION OF ONTARIO (ABORIGINAL PEOPLES)

The Chair: From the Indian Commission of Ontario (Aboriginal Peoples), Harry LaForme.

Mr LaForme: You have heard about the Indian Commission from Chris Reid, but I also wanted to point out, and it was confirmed by Mr Rickard on his way out, that I was the one lawyer he has respect for. I am happy to deliver that message as well.

The Chair: Mr Harnick and I had to resist that.

Mr Harnick: Are you getting ready to go back into private practice?

Mr LaForme: Maybe. First of all, I would like to introduce Kim Fullerton. He is counsel with the Indian Commission of Ontario, and he kindly agreed to attend here with me and hold my hand.

What I would like to say, first, is that I am here not only to provide you with a little information about the Indian Commission of Ontario—I intend to do that—and I do not know whether I can give you any answers to this constitutional dilemma, if I can call it that, but I think what would like to do is leave you with some things to think about.

As I indicated, I am here as more than just the commissioner of the Indian Commission of Ontario. I am a member of the Mississaugas of New Credit first nation, which is just outside of Brantford, and my father is currently the chief. You may have seen pictures of him on a magazine called *Business Journal*, and he is quite the celebrity these days. I litigated on behalf of Indian clients for about 10 years on issues like constitutional questions, land claims, hunting and fishing rights, treaty rights, aboriginal rights, all of it, until June 1989, when I was appointed commissioner to the Indian Commission of Ontario.

That commission is set up through joint orders in council from the Canadian and Ontario governments, and I am appointed the same way, through joint orders in council. One of the things we like to tell the participants is that our role is to represent issues that are of common concern to the governments of Canada, Ontario and the aboriginal people, or, more specifically, of first nations in Ontario; "first nations" for the most part is a synonymous term with "bands" as defined by the Indian Act. That is our role. We

help identify those issues and help the parties find ways to resolve those issues. As the previous speaker, Mr Reid, indicated to you, that is for the most part a process of mediation, and we like to characterize and function in that capacity, as mediators.

One of the things we do find difficult, however, is the role of the commission as being one of fair and neutral. We like to consider ourselves more fair than neutral. We have at times been accused by representatives of different bureaucracies of being biased, and I suppose we will accept that, that we are in fact biased. The counsel, both Kim Fullerton and Michael Coyle, were asked to join the commission by me for that reason. We are biased, and we are biased towards the issues themselves.

We do not think it is fair, for example, and we do not think the role should be neutral where you identify a problem, where you know what the answer is, and then for various reasons the parties cannot deliver on those answers. If I am unhappy as the commissioner because that cannot happen, or because the parties refuse to allow that to happen, then I accept that I am biased in that sense.

I would also like to point out that one of the things we bend over backwards or is to try to be, through that process, as fair as we can possibly be. We believe our role must be also to make that forum for discussion and resolution an equal playing field. That means that if first nations are at that table and they do not have the ability or the resources to represent themselves the same as government officials who come to the table, then we hope to some extent we can equalize that process.

It is through that process that we see a lot of the problems that are dealt with for the first nations of this country and, more specifically, this province. The current Premier has characterized it—and I have done so in the past—as a ping-pong game. We see the jurisdictional hassles that take place over aboriginal people. Classic examples are education, fishing or policing.

The argument goes that policing is a provincial responsibility under section 92 of the Constitution Act. That includes Indian reserves, that includes the province, the administration of justice—that is what it is characterized as—and therefore it is a provincial responsibility to provide the answers to inadequate policing in Indian communities. The response from the province at the table is that, no, that deals with Indian reserves, and that is a federal responsibility under section 91, class pf subject 24, so the debate goes on like that on virtually all issues.

It is not an answer, by the way, to say that the ping-pong game is going to stop. That is not the answer, because we have exchanged ping-pong now for tag. What happens now is that the parties come together and say, "If that's the policy of the provincial government" or: "If that's the policy of the federal government, then we're not going to go beyond that. If the federal government can only deliver so many dollars to this program, then we certainly can only deliver the same thing, and if that means building slums that are equal to the slums we have built in the past, then that's what we're going to have to do." That is not an answer. That may not be a ping-pong game any

longer, but it is not a game that is acceptable nor is it a game that allows the answers.

There is one answer, in my view, to all of it, which perhaps goes to the constitutional question, and that is to rethink the notion of what aboriginal people in this country are. They are not an ethnic minority in the true sense of the word. They are the first citizens, and they are in fact people this country ought to take a lot of pride in. They ought to give a lot of respect, because if it were not for them this country would not even be here. That respect then translates into these notions of equality and rights.

I am sure it does not come as any surprise to any of you that when you talk about Indians exercising their aboriginal and treaty rights, for example in fishing, it enrages user groups. They say: "Why? Why should they have any greater rights than we do? If we have to get a licence, if we're subject to quotas, then why aren't they?" I understand that there are reasons for quotas—conservation obviously is the most significant—but we have to rethink that notion about equality. In other words, equality is not about people wearing the same suits and walking the same streets and speaking the same language and being subject to the same laws. That is not equality; that is automatism. Equality is about respect.

My version of equality, and I have heard other people say the same thing, can take a different approach. What is wrong with equality in the sense of saying every person has the right to preserve his culture and his language? What about that? That is something that should be equal, and in order for that to happen, you see, it means that different groups must be treated differently. The example was used in an article recently that in the case of Quebec, for example, to protect their culture and language they may need to increase immigration into their province; that is the way they might be able to deal with that. For first nations and their reserves, it may be just the opposite: They may find it necessary to limit immigration into their communities, and that is how they would preserve their culture and their identity. That is what it is about, and the Constitution must reflect that and must allow for that.

We cannot continue the way we are. Quebec will tell you, for example, that it allowed the rest of Canada to deal with the preservation of its culture, its language, its identity as a distinct society, and it did not work. Well, I can tell you that the aboriginal people of this country are in the same situation. For over 200 years they have said the same thing: "We have left it up to the governments of Canada and the provincial governments. It hasn't worked."

The hundreds of languages we had are now down to 52, and they are dying off. Cultural identity in some cases is lost. In my reserve, for example, we do not know what our culture was all about. Our language is dead from our community—that is a shame—and it should not be. But that is what that is about. You ask, how does that translate? The notion of self-government, I know, is one that often times almost causes apoplexy in people. It should not, and there is a reason it should not. Because the aboriginal people of this country are not talking about sovereign enclaves—for the most part they are not—where they can have tanks and they can have their own armies and their own police

forces—well, certainly police forces. But it is not about sovereignty in that sense of the word. It is not sovereignty in the sense that they do not want to be a part of Canada and you only need to reflect on the history of this constitutional patriation to understand that.

1220

In 1981, the aboriginal people of this country made a conscious decision to deal with the Constitution and provisions that went into the Constitution. They assisted in the drafting of section 35. The other option was, "Forget about your Constitution; we don't care what you say about us in your Constitution because we aren't bound by it," but they did not do that. They wanted to partner with Canada. They wanted to be partners in Confederation and they saw so in 1982 and they worked hard thereafter for years to take that one step further and entrench the right to self-government in the Constitution. That process failed, but that desire is still there to have self-government entrenched in a Constitution, because it is only in that way it will work.

What we talk about today in terms of self-government under policy requires enabling legislation, for example. That is what the Indian Act is. The Indian Act is enabling legislation for self-government in Indian communities. It does not work. The only way to properly respect and identify the right—and if this government of Ontario truly believes in the inherent right to self-government of aboriginal peoples it should work towards the entrenchment of that in the Constitution, because that is what it is going to take and nothing short of that is going to suffice. I do not care how attractive self-government negotiated through enabling legislation is. It is still government that is granted and not recognized, and that is important. The Constitution in this country should have as its theme integration, multiculturalism and not assimilation of all peoples. That is what the theme should be.

What is the role of provincial governments in this province? I think it is basically twofold. I just touched upon one, that is, to ensure the entrenchment of aboriginal self-government in the Constitution. I think more fundamentally—that was touched on by the previous speaker—there is one other role the province can play; that is, to give true meaning to section 35. Unfortunately, the courts in this country and the Supreme Court of Canada are ahead of the governments in terms of what they interpret the rights of aboriginal people to be, light years ahead. Government and bureaucracies do not seem to be able to catch up. But you can and you must try.

For example, you want to give respect to aboriginal peoples and recognize their rights? Stop arresting them for fishing pursuant to their aboriginal and treaty rights. Appreciate their rights to regulate their own communities, and when they say gaming on an Indian reserve provides an economic base to that community and provides some kind of social activity that is meaningful and has benefits, quit arresting them for having bingo games. I mean, we have to be able to find ways to do that, and that is the way to do it.

If you are going to give true substance, then do it. Do not turn the ping-pong game into a game of tag. That is not the answer. If you really believe in the inherent right to self-government, and if you believe in the respect and tr

aning of treaties and aboriginal rights, then you have an opportunity to do something about it, and to do less is irking your responsibility.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr LaForme, for your presentation.

AD HOC COMMITTEE OF WOMEN AND THE CONSTITUTION

The Chair: I call next the representatives from the Ad Hoc Committee of Women and the Constitution. Just for the record, it would be useful if you could identify the people who are here before us.

Ms Hill: Certainly. We are the Ad Hoc Committee of Canadian Women and the Constitution. My name is Lynda Hill. To my right is Linda Nye. To her right is Romily Perry. To her right is Shana Wong. To her right is Marion Vries.

Marion and Shana will be reading some statistics over the course of our 15-minute presentation. We have a number of questions that we would like to pose to the panel. We understand that you are operating under some time constraints. We have 15 minutes to do this, so I will keep my eye on the clock. If you could proceed with the first question, Linda.

Ms Nye: Thanks very much, Lynda. It was true for us I during the three years of the Meech struggle and now appears to be true for us again in facing this tremendous challenge of building a new Confederation that what we're offered by our governments are hearings as the only process, or certainly the best process and the first process, and these hearings are government staffed and government scheduled and government controlled. What we want to know is, what alternatives have been considered and are there now in the table right now other than these kinds of hearings?

Mr Bisson: You are asking anybody on the committee?

Ms Nye: Anyone.

The Chair: No. I can try to answer if that is the way in which you want to try to do the process. I said earlier today, although you may not have been here, that we recognize that this first stage of our process is only a first stage of a process that we know needs to continue. We recognize that in this first part, even with the extensive consultations and the number of people that we have heard from, we cannot presume that we are going to hear from all of the people in the province who want to be involved in these discussions. We are conscious of that. We do feel that we have been getting at least an initial sounding from the people of the province on the various issues.

We will be looking at structuring the second stage of our work in a way that will allow groups of people to hopefully come together and to talk not only with us but with each other. I cannot be any more specific than that because we have not discussed any of those specifics. But we have talked informally about some process of bringing people together from different constituencies and we are quite conscious of the fact that in the people who have appeared before us, while there have been a number of women, there have been many more men who have appeared before us. Obviously the concerns that women have

in this process and in the process of the Meech Lake accord are something that we are aware of, and I think it is something that we will do our best to try to address in the process of the next stage of our work.

As I say, we will be looking at some options, including some conferences or meetings or other ways of bringing people together, but that is as specific as we are able to get at this point.

Ms Nye: Thank you.

Ms Hill: Okay. Next question?

Ms Perry: You did say just now that you were thinking of other ways of dealing with this process and you were going to bring groups together to talk. Well, the idea we are trying to get across is that you are always making those decisions. You are the select committee. If we are going to have a select committee, who do you really think should be selected to sit on that select committee? Should they be representatives, as they are now, from the Legislature or should they perhaps be representatives representing the community?

Ms Churley: What I would like to hear, because I have been grappling with this as one of the female members of the committee—certainly what was involved in the Meech process—and what I am hoping to hear from you are some suggestions, and you are getting on to that in terms of your questions, but to suggest to us some ideas for how we can make sure that this process is inclusive and that women are involved as well as aboriginals and the disabled. I am really hoping that you will give me and the rest of the committee some suggestions today as to how we can best do that.

Ms Perry: If you keep asking us questions when we badly need some information from you, we think you should have been asking these questions of yourself a long time ago.

Ms Churley: We are, and we want some suggestions—

The Chair: That is fair enough.

1230

Ms Perry: We have gone through a process ourselves with trying to find out what the women of Canada think about their country and how they would like to participate in it. Last September we started a process whereby we would put together a discussion paper and send it across the country to women and invite them to hold coffee parties, dinner parties, pizza parties in their own homes starting 14 February and answer the questions on the discussion paper and get back to us.

We spent a lot more time than this committee did on preparing for it. We sent out resource materials on limited funds and limited time. We just started. We started on 14 February and it is open. We have not closed the board. They are allowed to get back to us on their time schedule and then we will get on with looking at what they said and go from there.

The Chair: All right. Let me be clear then, and I'm trying very hard not to be defensive about this, that we did not design this process. We are here because we were appointed to be members of this committee.

Ms Perry: Did you question it?

The Chair: We understand that there are flaws in the process that we are embarked upon.

Ms Perry: Do you know how many years we have been hearing this? "There are flaws in the process."

Ms Nye: You have to understand that to be asked under these same circumstances to present again—maybe we can help you by telling you that what we intended to do this morning was to ask you a series of questions that were the same questions that we were asking ourselves about you during these last two weeks when we have desperately tried to find time to get together to do something. The first question that we asked ourselves was whether we should bother.

We thought, first of all, that what we would do is we would gather up all of the presentations that we have made over the last four years—no, make that since 1980, and we would say: "If you want to know what women think, here. Read them and this time pay some attention."

The second thing we thought of doing was dressing up in men's clothing. That is how frustrated we were feeling.

The third thing we thought of doing was dressing up in women's clothing from the various decades and telling you our stories from 1867, when the Fathers of Confederation put Confederation together without us, and then telling you the stories of women after the First World War, after the Second World War and telling you the stories of women right up to 1987, when we were handed a document that introduced to us the modern Fathers of Confederation. And those are not our words; those were the words of the 11 men who did it once again without us.

Now here we come into 1991, and what we believed very strongly after the Meech Lake amendment process divided us so badly—and we do lay the process that divided us so badly squarely at the feet of a government. What we believed was necessary was that people, women and men, had to begin to talk, begin the discussion, of what kind of Canada we wanted today. We had to even put the Constitution and the charter aside for a moment and we had to talk. So we decided that for women, that is what we would do. We would try, as the ad hoc committee, to be a catalyst and we began that on Equality Eve.

Now, on Friday 1 February I received by courier a document from the Ontario government, from this committee, that said it was a discussion paper. And when I received this document, I also received with it the news that the hearings would start on Monday and my reply was, "And do they end Tuesday or Wednesday?"

In the middle of that, of course, we were up to our ears in making Equality Eve happen, so we could not even address any of this until after 14 February. So we have had less than two weeks to try and pull women together who even just belong to the very active part of the ad hoc committee and forget any other women, and most of those women could not make it to the very few meetings that we tried to call. We have just gone through a very painful and stressful process over the last two weeks, because it is all the same to us. What the women on either end of this group are going to be doing and have been doing is read-

ing to you the statistics of our lives, because they are the realities of our lives. And now what we are feeling and seeing is that even this new Confederation is going to be done without us.

When I read that discussion paper, do you know how hard I had to search to find anything on women, about women's lives? I believe there is one line. Do you know how that feels after all of this time, when all you are asking for is a chance to be part of it, a chance to create that future that belongs to you too?

We came before the Beer commission and we said to all those people, "You are the members of the Legislature we are not." It is not enough to us to say to us that this is not your process; you are only doing your jobs. You know?

The Chair: That is not what I was saying, but I will comment more on that later.

Ms Nye: We need you to stand up and say no, and on of our questions to you then is around your discussion paper. Why do you prepare a discussion paper, first of all without us, as it appears to have been done? Second of all why do you give us no time to discuss it before you want to hear from us?

The Chair: Again I think we could get into a long back and forth about some of these things, but just to clarify—and I realize that anything that even explains this might sound again like it is being defensive—the discussion paper was not prepared by the committee members. The discussion paper was prepared by the government. We again all realize the problems—

Ms Nye: I am sorry. What does that mean, "by the government"?

The Chair: It means that this is a committee of the Legislature. It obviously is made up of government member and opposition members. The committee itself did not set up the discussion paper. That is not to say that we agree or disagree with the content of it and the process, but just for the record, that maybe needs to be clarified.

We realize again that there are problems in terms of that there was not much time between the time that the paper was available and the time that people had to start speaking to us, but I think we just want to underline again that we do not see this process of this month of hearings as being the only opportunity that we are going to give or that the people of the province are going to have to address this issue.

Ms Nye: Do you even see that you are the people who should come up with the process?

The Chair: No, and I was trying to get to saying that in fact we do not see that we are the only ones who are coming up with the process. In fact one of the things that we have been picking up as we have been going along have been some very clear wishes and some very clear expressions of a different process that should be put in place.

Ms Nye: And have you read the reports of the past constitutional hearings?

The Chair: I have read some of those reports—

Ms Nye: And their recommendations on process?

The Chair: The committee members have access to those reports, and I think that we felt that it was important initially to give people across the province an opportunity to talk to us. I should say that this committee has done a more extensive canvassing of people's opinions than has ever been done before, so we are making some progress in that area.

But we are the first to acknowledge that there is a lot more that needs to be done. We have had, I think for the first time as a committee of the Legislature, people who have been working with us do some outreach into the various constituencies, including women's groups, to ensure that more and more people from the different constituencies that make up Ontario actually did come before us and speak to us.

Ms Nye: Those people were appointed one week before our hearings started.

The Chair: Yes.

Ms Nye: Do you know how much time it takes to even reach groups?

The Chair: I understand that, and what I am saying is that we are not disagreeing with your criticism of us on that. All right?

Ms Nye: But why did you agree to this process then, when you cannot get from us anything but—

The Chair: For two reasons: One, because things are happening across the country and we need to begin to deal with those realities, and second, because we saw this, as I have been saying and saying again, as one part of an ongoing process.

As I say, without trying to sound defensive, we accept the criticism that you have put before us and that other people have put before us—other women and other men, in fact; men from various other constituencies as well—and we know that a different and more enlarged process needs to be put in place. What we would like from you, quite frankly, is your advice about how we can do that more effectively.

40

Ms Perry: Our questions that we were going to just lead to you were definitely, hopefully, going to put some meat into your heads about how the process should happen and take place. First of all, we do not believe it should be a select committee of members of Parliament or members of the Legislature; it should be people who represent their community. Part of the reason we have come to this way of thinking is that we have been through a number of these hearings and we have seen what happens. Basically you are responsible to your Legislature; you are not responsible to the people. You may represent your individual ridings, but you do not represent the people of the province.

There are no native people in your party. Therefore, there are no native people sitting on the committee that is supposed to be talking about their issues. You cannot understand the community unless you have the community talking to itself. The community has to come up with the rules of the process and the discussion paper in itself. We know that questions to ask our own community, our women's

community, because we live those lives and we know what is top of our agenda.

Getting to agendas, one of the most frustrating things for us on this level too is this time commitment that is plugged in all the time. We went through this with the last hearings. The time was so short. Then what happened? The reports were just sort of shelved and left on their own. Now you have another committee and it has to happen this way. Whose clock are we working by? Since when did the dismantling and reuniting together of Canada take place in a matter of months, within a year? How are people going to feel a sense of ownership of their country, of their Constitution, of their Charter of Rights, unless they understand the fundamental principles behind all of this? How are they going to feel ownership if they have not been able to participate in the building process?

Ms Nye: We know that for many of you anyway this is your first hearing, and not for some of us in a long list, and we do believe that you would like to do something useful. What we do not believe is that you understand the situation for community groups even when you are asking us to help, to be part of the process, to give you some information.

To call hearings and set up outreach people within a very short period of time and to have very little in the way of resources is to really show a great deal of disrespect to those of us in the community who are trying, in the time that we have left over from some other things in our lives that we would like to do, to come together and to participate. For women this is extremely difficult because we are not yet a very great percentage of the legislatures or even the bureaucracy, and certainly not of any of the decision-making and policymaking bodies.

When it comes time to do something like this, build a new Confederation, we do not want to have to spend time coming together to be enraged about this process and enraged that we are not given enough time and enraged that we are not given enough process and enraged that we are not even consulted about the process.

We want to come together in the little time that we can make available to each other to talk first of all among each other, and then among the broader community. We are doing that but you have to understand—I know it must not be the most pleasant of tasks to be on the defensive, but we really do believe that there is not much defence for this after all this time, that in fact there really is no defence for a government that gives people a discussion paper and no time to discuss it.

Most of the women's groups received the discussion paper after you started the hearings. You started up north. I do not know what chance those people had of getting the paper, getting together, so what you hear from is not even the groups. You hear from, as we introduced ourselves, a select committee of the ad hoc committee. We have not had time to reach out to our members, even those just within Ontario.

What can we give you today besides our frustration, our pain, and somehow one more attempt to say: "Will you please hear us? Will you, as members of the Legislature, not take part? Will you stop this? Will you say, 'Listen, it's

a good idea that we start to wander around the province and listen to Ontarians, but it's not a good idea to do it this fast and this quickly?" It is a good idea for Ontarians to come together and talk, and it is a good idea for the government to give them the resources they need to do it. It is a good idea for Ontarians to think about Ontario and Canada and what this new Confederation should look like or could look like, but it is going to take a while.

It takes longer than rent control, but do we see it given longer than rent control issues? It takes longer than anything, I would think, because it is bigger than anything else. We are at the point, unfortunately and sadly, that we are more divided than ever. Our assumption is it is going to take longer and that what builds community is what is needed, and rushing us and stressing us and angering us and not giving us a chance to do what we need to do and not giving us the support that we need in order to do it, is not the way.

We know the kind of money that has gone into this committee and we say, "Well, you know, I mean, what can we do?" We also thought of just coming in with all our pile of briefs and dusting them off and saying, "We'll just read them to you because we have not changed our minds."

We cannot give you some of the things that women are thinking about with this new Confederation because we have just started. What we can ask is that if you have a 21 March report, and I do not know how you are going to do a decent report in 20 days, I do not know how you are going—who is going to write this? What will it say and who will decide what it says? How much time do you actually have to write it when you have to translate it? We have the same questions about your report as we did about the discussion paper. How many languages are enough? Are English and French enough?

Ms Perry: Is print enough?

Ms Nye: Is print enough? One of our active members is Liz Stimpson, blind, she was called a week after the hearings began. She had to pull out all stops in order to get 15 minutes with you tomorrow morning and believe me, if you think we are a little put off, you ain't seen nothing yet.

She had to ask that it be sent to her on tape. It was not ready on tape. She knows that what somebody had to do was run off in a corner and read it into a tape machine and send her a tape very quickly. That does not do for people who need it in other forms, other than print and tape, and these are Ontario citizens. We are all Ontario citizens and women are half of every group you can name. So we have double jeopardy and double needs, in that sense, and sometimes triple and quadruple.

This report: Can you by 21 March have it out in all of those forms? Can you have it vetted by the community? Or will it in fact be the only thing that we think you can do, and that is to stand up and say, "What Ontarians have told us is that this is not the way to go about it, that the deadline is not the deadline, that we have to open up a process that takes as long as we need, that if it takes two years"—and surely corporations make two-year plans; surely a country can make a two-year plan and take the time to build a process that is inclusive and democratic rather than this

one that we find is exclusive because we cannot find the time and the resources we need, and we are not given the time and resources we need to participate.

Ms Perry: We do not have faith in these committee any more either.

Ms Nye: We could not get some women to participate. We called the Ad Hoc Coalition of Visible Minority and Multicultural Associations, the women's groups in there and they just said, "Why?"

Ms Perry: That is my point.

Ms Nye: "Besides," they said, "we can't do this. You've got two weeks, forget it." They did not know that the committee hearings were on. They did not know that we had already started and they sure were not happy to hear when you were finishing and they would not participate with us. What you do even by this process is you break down community and we believe that building a country has to do with building a community, the same as we believe that Constitution-writing and charter-writing is building community. We want to build it with you, but you are not giving us what we need and you are not standing up and saying no to something that is worse than neutral.

Ms Wong: [Remarks in Chinese]

Ms Perry: I have to go and pick up my children. They have been waiting outside the school for a while now. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay; thank you very much.

Ms Nye: Shana, why do you not make your statement?

Ms Wong: I have been reading some statistics in my mother tongue. If you feel angry or frustrated because you did not understand what I was trying to say, maybe you will understand the people who are left out of this consultation process because of language or other restrictions.

Ms deVries: I have been reading statistics too, although not as many as I wanted to. I was sort of giving you historical statistics, the point of which is that things have not changed very much in the last 100 years for women in this country, and for minorities. They have changed a little bit, but it is happening too slowly and we think that by opening up the process and by giving people the opportunity to talk to each other, maybe in community weekend conferences—I think Linda is going to talk about her idea of the people's commission, rather than the politicians' commission. Give us the resources, give us the money, give us the computers we need and that type of thing, so statistics, you have seen them all before, read them again if you need an extra jolt, but let's get down to work.

Ms Nye: In fact, Moira Armour and Pat Stanton, who created this incredible chronology of statistics, Canadian Women in History, have asked us to leave a copy with you. They are also available at the Toronto Women's Book Store for \$25, but she made me promise that I would not ask you for the first \$25, so it is a gift from us so that you will have it in your resources. We will, as quickly as we can, write out for you these questions that we have for you that we would like asked before things start, rather than after.

We will give you copies of our presentations to the other commissions so that you can see what, at least to that point in time, many of us were thinking and believing, but this is a new question and we have had an incredible life of statistics. I do not know whether you believe this, but it is really not fun to have to come and rant and rave. We would really like to be invited to participate. We are not prepared to let the future be designed without us.

We look at the statistics, even of building this country, and we go from 1867 right to this year and we are saying that we have to be much more creative and open and there has to be much more discussion and dialogue, and that more of that has to be put into the hands of the community,

with the support of the government, so that we are working with you. I leave you with it.

The Chair: Could I check to see if our last presenters are here, l'Association des centres pour aînés de l'Ontario? It has been indicated that they may not be here this morning. All right, that concludes then our morning session. We will recess till 2:15. The first group for this afternoon has asked to be put at the end of the afternoon session so we will be able to come back at 2:15, but we would like to try to start as promptly as we can please.

The committee recessed at 1255.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1426.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are pleased to resume our hearings this afternoon from the Legislative Building here in Toronto. This is the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, and we have a full day of hearings today, this evening and tomorrow as well, to conclude our hearings on Ontario in Confederation.

SCIENCE FOR PEACE

The Chair: We are going to start without any further delay. I call Science for Peace to come forward. I will just remind groups presenting of the time restraints we are working under and the 15 minutes we have allotted for each group.

Dr Valleau: Thank you for the opportunity to appear. Science for Peace is a nationwide organization of physical and social scientists dedicated to ensuring that scientific methods be applied to bettering the lot of people and not to waging war. Founded 10 years ago, Science for Peace does research and attempts to inform the government and the public on a broad range of issues involving world and national security, disarmament and environmental degradation, where our professional expertise allows us to make a contribution.

We want to raise with you a couple of constitutional considerations bearing on the threats of war. This may seem somehow slightly peripheral to what is naturally at the core of your deliberations, namely, the relationship of Quebec to the rest of the country. However, now, when Canada is re-examining its constitutional structure, is presumably the moment to raise our questions. Nor are they irrelevant to the central Québécois problems, as memories of the two great conscription crises will confirm, for they form part of the compact which defines us as Canadians.

The Gulf war has highlighted some of these issues and recalled some basic legal and moral problems which we want to raise with you now. I will discuss one of them and Professor Eric Fawcett, our executive vice-president, will add a few words afterwards.

What I want to mention is the way we decide to go to war. No other national decision is more grave, as it concerns the death and suffering of both Canadians and others, and also irrevocably alters Canada's relations with the other nations of the world. Indeed, if the world is long to survive, war must very quickly be rejected as a means of conflict resolution.

Yet we have the situation that the government can make the decision to go to war unilaterally without so much as securing the approval of Parliament beforehand. This is surprising to most Canadians and disturbing. There seems to be a requirement that Parliament ratify a formal declaration of war after the fact, but we have recently seen how unrealistic that is as a safeguard once Canadian forces personnel have been committed. The decision to wage war is far too serious to be treated in this offhand manner. It may be recalled that the role of the Canadian forces in the

Gulf was initially only in support of the UN trade blockade of Iraq, but was gradually transformed into the bombing of innocent victims. Yet for many months the government refused even a parliamentary debate on the subject.

The conditions under which Canada might wage war should, in our opinion, be spelled out carefully in the Constitution. At a very minimum, Parliament should have to declare a war before Canadian troops are deployed in action outside our borders. A broader debate on this subject is desirable, however. Is a parliamentary decision adequate, in fact? The war decision is so grave that greater safeguards should perhaps be considered. It is grave in two important ways.

First, the decision is really, especially with modern weaponry, that of burning people alive, of people dying in agony, of bloody, mangled children and dead mothers. It is also a decision to risk disastrous damage to the ecosystem on which our future health and even existence depend. This is the moral dimension of the decision. It demands the most careful and considered balancing of these horrors against their supposed benefits before the choice of war should be made.

Second, some decisions are political in the sense that the resulting policies, if we do not like them, can presently be reversed by a new government or even by the old one. Once the nation has gone to war, however, its status in the world is permanently altered in a way we cannot afterwards choose to reverse. The ground rules under which we operate have thereby been changed. In this respect the war decision is itself like a constitutional change. Perhaps, for constitutional amendments, greater safeguards and a parliamentary decision are needed to safeguard our future and the life and safety of our citizens and of others.

As we say, a wide-ranging public debate on these questions is long overdue. Our brief draws attention to a number of associated questions, including one very basic one: Would Canadians favour a constitutional requirement which forbade Canada from sending armed forces outside our own boundaries, except perhaps under a unified UN command for peacekeeping purposes? The nations of Germany and Japan have such requirements in their constitutions, and it is pretty clear that it does not reduce their security and enhances the security of the rest of us. There are two other aspects of this not addressed in our brief that I would like to raise briefly. One concerns Canada's association with such collective security arrangements as the North American Air Defence Command and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As presently constituted, they represent a quite extraordinary surrender of our national sovereignty, for it is clear that Canada could be committed to war without even so much as the government's approval. This interpretation is confirmed by the events of the Cuban missile crisis, for example, in which Canada's forces were mobilized into action against the wishes of the Prime Minister and before any decision by the Minister of National Defence. Express constitutional safeguards are required

against such a surrender of sovereignty in so important a matter in time of peace.

A second matter concerns internal security. Most of the country was dismayed to see at Oka last September that our army mobilized against our own citizens, apparently in the simple request of a provincial government, in what was essentially a matter of policing. The potential for repression is all too obvious. The decision to use military forces for internal operations, like that to wage war, needs to be brought under strict and more restrictive constitutional safeguards.

Dr Fawcett: I should like now to discuss another related matter which is also of concern to Science for Peace, that of conscientious objection to taking part in violence. It appears that the right to such status should already be ensured under section 2(a) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guaranteeing freedom of conscience. However, the area still appears somewhat grey, especially with respect to members of the armed forces.

I refer you to the appendix on the last page of our brief, which is an article by Michael Valpy in the Tuesday 29 January Globe and Mail based on the research of Toronto lawyer Marlys Edwardh:

"Members of the Canadian Forces cannot avoid going to war by claiming conscientious-objector status....The Criminal Code imposes penalties of imprisonment for anyone who assists deserters or people absent without leave from the military, or who in any way advises, counsels or educates members of the armed forces to refuse duty....Counselling or advising, moreover, includes the actions of anyone who 'publishes, edits, issues, circulates or distributes a writing' urging members of the armed forces to refuse duty or to be insubordinate or disloyal.

"It requires no political acumen to predict that eventually some group opposed to war will publish a pamphlet or leaflet urging members of the armed forces"—for example—"to refuse duty in the Persian Gulf."

It is perfectly conceivable that a young woman or man would be willing to join our forces with a view to defending Canada's shores but find it morally unacceptable to be sent overseas to kill innocent people for a cause that she or he considers insufficient or entirely inappropriate. The soldier needs to be accorded respect for that opinion and the possibility to refuse regarding such a role. This protection needs to be guaranteed. So does the assurance that in the event of conscription no conscripted person be required to carry out duties which she or he finds morally unacceptable. The question may be raised about the viability of the traditional army under such guarantees. So it should be.

There is a further legal and ethical problem lurking here. Under the legal apparatus that we all accepted for the Nuremberg war crimes tribunals, each person became liable for the legality and moral acceptability of his or her personal actions, whatever the orders he or she might receive. In the light of this, it seems doubtful that citizens can be asked to carry out orders they may find objectionable. There are difficult legal problems here on which legal advice is required and which we have not yet adequately researched. The legality of traditional military discipline

appears to us to be in serious question, however. We thank the committee for its attention.

Mr Winninger: I will direct the first question to Professor Valteau. I must commend the work you do on behalf of Science for Peace. I would ask this question, however. Much of the modern weaponry being used is a product of scientific and engineering research. Many scientists work on research contracts with the US Department of Defence and Canadian ministry of defence, in university and other environments. I am just wondering how your profession is coming to grips with that conflict within the profession. On the one hand, people like you are moving towards peaceful conflict resolutions, whereas others are actually engaged in research that enhances our ability to conduct warfare and take lives on a massive scale.

Dr Valteau: I am completely in sympathy with your question. Of course, it is a big issue within the scientific community, one that is remarkably hard to come to grips with. For one thing, the records are not very available to us for most of the contracts you mention and it requires tremendous effort to ferret them out, as we try to do.

Some things we have done: We have addressed the local universities with respect to their policy on such matters, with a mixed reception, but at least we have written assurances that both York University and the University of Toronto and some other Canadian universities will not allow members of their faculties to accept contracts for which it is possible to classify the results of the research. I hope that is indeed being implemented as well as assured.

There was also attempt by the ministry of supply and services to force people who had Canadian government contracts to pass security checks a few years ago. As a result of vigorous lobbying in the university, the University of Toronto rejected that successfully; the government simply backed down. But I guess this is a question of ongoing surveillance and the attempt to gradually shift the attitudes of both government and the profession.

Dr Fawcett: I might add that our president is Professor David Parnas, computer scientist at Queen's University. He is a celebrated computer scientist, and one might say he is notorious also as having resigned from the highest-level battle planning committee of computers in SDI, the strategic defence initiative. The reason he resigned was not because he had moral objections to working for weapons systems but the moral status of the committee of which he was a member. He maintained—and subsequent developments in SDI have shown and vindicated that belief—that every member of that committee knew that SDI would never work, the computer systems could never be developed. Furthermore, he still maintains that he does not object in principle to working on weapons systems; it is the manner in which the whole military-industrial complex is manipulated, and its ends are often at variance with those of the country. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We will move on to the next group.

1440

SOCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL
OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

The Chair: I call next the Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

Dr Doyle: My name is Robert Doyle; I am senior program director of the social planning council. With me is Susan Zytaruk, a board member and chair of a committee called greater Toronto area in transition. I will start out by making some comments and then Susan will pick it up and we will throw the ball back and forth.

First of all, we want to say that the Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto is a social planning body supported by the United Way and by Metro council. We are governed by a committee of 40 members from the community and we work from a Metro base to address social policy issues affecting Metro.

In social policy it is important to look at principles, to look at objectives, and to look at the effects of all policies, whether they are economic or environmental as well as social. Social policy has to do with equity, it has to do with distribution and redistribution of social benefits, and also compensating people for changes, that is, compensating victims, you might say, for changes which are wrought by various other policies. We see social policy as including economic and social objectives, and social policy deals with the welfare of all citizens. It does not just deal with the poor but with the welfare of all citizens, so we do not want to talk simply in the sense of welfare or social assistance but the welfare of the community.

I want to comment on a couple of areas, one of which I would call common purpose. Second, Susan is going to talk about the impact of social and economic policies, including some of the recent announcements such as the federal policy yesterday, and also multiculturalism.

First, on common purpose: What is the nature of government's responsibility to promote social justice and equity? Why do we have governments? St Augustine said that governments without justice are nothing but bands of thieves. Confederation is not simply a legal document or an agreement among governments, as we saw by the discussions around Meech Lake. And as the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future is now hearing, Canadians do not simply see Canada in terms of structures, but of common bonds, traditions and purpose. We are concerned in the social planning council, as a citizens' organization, that this sense of purpose is being lost in Canada by decisions of various governments, especially the federal government.

What common purpose is there when our national standards and our national programs and institutions are being gutted and dismantled, when national standards are being eroded? What national purpose is there when the federal government simply shifts its financial burden to the provinces? We need to recognize that a social contract exists between people and governments in Canada and that many people insist that this social contract be honoured and maintained. Ontario must continue to take leadership in maintaining some semblance of national purpose and to

engage other provinces and the federal government in maintaining some degree of national programs and standards.

Ms Zytaruk: The political union of this country is inextricably linked to the economic and social wellbeing of its citizens. This unity is fuelled by inequities in the wellbeing of individuals and communities. Increasing economic and social disparities across the land are creating discouragement, dissension and even despair.

The current federal government policies are tearing away at the social fabric of this country and are actively promoting conflicting regionalism. When the people are no longer well-served by one level of government, they, in true free-market fashion, go shopping for another, and there is a risk of this country eroding into five mini-states: the Yukon and Northwest Territories, the western and prairie provinces, Ontario, Quebec, and the Atlantic province. The only national peoples will be the first peoples, and their survival in a broken-down country is questionable.

None of these mini-states will be able to maintain the economic, political and social status of Canada as we know it today. We in Ontario probably have the best chance of surviving as an autonomous entity and therefore must provide leadership to ensure that Canada survive this constitutional crisis in a way that recognizes cultural and linguistic differences without further undermining the economic and social wellbeing of its citizens, particularly its vulnerable citizens.

Further, decentralization, as is being promoted by Bill C-69 and by the latest federal budget, undermines our essential services. Universal medicare, unemployment insurance, pensions, post-secondary education, social housing, child care, family benefits are all being eroded by the federal government's economic and social policies.

We look to this provincial government to provide leadership at this difficult time by responding to the needs of its citizens, by encouraging the other provinces to do likewise and by mobilizing provincial support to bring pressure on the federal government to stop the dismantling of the land.

We recognize the economic stress the province is under, but we ask you not to pass the brunt of this economic stress on to families and communities that are already having difficulty coping. The decision announced by the Minister of Community and Social Services yesterday that the SARC reforms will be delayed as a result of curbing federal contributions are truly regrettable. The SAR report has well documented the inequities of the current system and these inequities are only being heightened as more and more people become dependent on the community for support and are then condemned to living in poverty.

The municipalities are reeling under the impact of trying to pay for 20% of the cost of general welfare benefit. Intolerable and unacceptable choices among vulnerable groups are being made. Yesterday the commissioner of social services in the region of Peel announced that funding for social assistance budgets would be taken from funds for child care and services for seniors because they are not mandated services. The most vulnerable members of our society, the elderly and children, are being expected to carry the load of inadequate economic and social policies.

his seems to be how truly the trickle-down theory of neoconservative economic policies really work.

Here in Toronto, the food banks are seeing more and more unemployed and working-poor families lining up for donations, and apparently now for a family, for three days, it's two eggs and two cups of powdered skim milk.

We urge this government not to forego its goal of eliminating food banks. We urge you to follow through on your planned reform of the social assistance system. We urge you to initiate economic reform, with labour market policies that promote employment. People in this country want to work. Job training programs, child care subsidies and community development programs are key components of such employment strategies.

We urge you to provide leadership to your colleagues in the other provinces to support national standards in the field of health and social services. In response to the federal budget, the Quebec health and social services minister announced that he has resolved to fight for exclusive provincial power in the field of health and social services and is calling on the other provinces to do likewise. We are very concerned that without national standards and given the growing disparities in the capacity of provinces to adequately fund services, that the quality, accessibility and availability of health and social services will be seriously diminished and will vary drastically across the country.

Our universal programs have been a unifying force and their loss will acutely aggravate the existence of have and have-not regions and accelerate the balkanization of this country. Having been rejected by one nation, marginalized regions will be vulnerable to takeover by another. As this federal government pursues social and economic policies to adhere to the same level playing field with our American neighbour, it will soon find that fewer and fewer shirts of the players in that field are sporting the maple leaf.

A strong, vibrant and unified country depends on strong, vibrant individuals and communities supported by a safety net of social supports. Ontario must seek to provide those supports for its citizens and bring pressure on the other provinces and the federal government to do likewise.

Dr Doyle: I just want to make some comments about multiculturalism. As we know, Canada and Ontario certainly are multicultural societies, and Canada has a good legislative and policy framework for multiculturalism. We have the Charter of Rights, we have a multiculturalism act that many other countries are very interested in. Canada has a multicultural program. Ontario has a multicultural strategy. The problem is, however, that neither the program nor the strategy is a program or strategy. They are really a set of unco-ordinated and sometimes ineffective projects and initiatives.

Confederation, in our mind, will not be a living reality unless citizens feel that they are allowed to make a contribution to the community and to be given an opportunity to become genuinely involved in its life. People, we think, and people whom we talk to from various cultural and racial communities, are not willing to accept any more hollow programs and strategies that have no significant impact on their lives.

I had the fortune of being in Australia last year, and the double fortune of being there during the Canadian winter for four months at the office of multicultural affairs in the department of the Prime Minister, and I was able to look at a number of initiatives that were happening across the country. One of the things that I thought was quite interesting is that multiculturalism in Australia is being promoted in terms of three interrelated goals. One has to do with social justice, another has to do with economic development and a third has to do with cultural factors. So multiculturalism as a program and as a policy has then three goals, which are economic, cultural and justice.

1450

Also, they have a federal national strategy on access and equity and a federal strategy that is linked into what the states are doing in terms of access and equity, and at each departmental level, departments have to produce plans about what they are going to do in terms of multiculturalism for the year. These plans are published so that they are openly available to people in communities, so people are aware of what is planned. They can monitor them, they can evaluate what is being done and they can continually advocate with government what should be done in terms of multiculturalism and making it a reality in their lives.

Unfortunately, in Canada this is not done. We do not have any real public accounting, we do not have any planning beforehand and we do not have any openness in terms of the system. So what we propose in terms of making multiculturalism a reality in this province and in Canada is that some of the ideas that are being developed in other places perhaps can inform us in making, you know, better programs and policies in the future.

We will just stop there at this point.

The Chair: Thank you very much for the presentation. Questions? Mr Beer.

Mr Beer: Thank you very much for your presentation. You are the second group today that has talked about the erosion of the federal involvement in the broad range of social and health programs and clearly one of the concerns there is the implication of that, as you say, for national standards. In a sense, it is like amending the Constitution, except in a different way. I am wondering, do you see any sense among other councils such as your own, the Ontario council, those in other provinces, that there is a coming together, a kind of lobby that would be able to develop to really raise this to a much higher level of consciousness with the general public? I think we tend to look at budgets, and we know they affect us, but we do not see them necessarily reaching as far as some of the changes in the last couple of years, which really do hit at the ability of the federal government to have a role in national standards, whether we are talking the post-secondary level or in health care or in social services. I am just wondering what you see from your perspective, both where Ontario should be going and what kinds of things you and your colleagues can do to try to change the direction.

Dr Doyle: Well, just in relation to Bill C-69, which Susan mentioned, which was the bill to limit the increases

to Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta around these programs, there was a lobby that was organized by five national organizations, including the Canadian Council on Social Development, the Vanier Institute of the Family and the Canadian Council on Children and Youth and others to do that, and it was through those connections that we became also involved in work around Bill C-69. So there is kind of a loose, in one sense, national network to do that.

In Ontario we do not have the same—well, we have a number of social planning bodies across the province, but a lot of these social planning councils are not staffed. They are not in a very good financial position. They have not been supported financially and they are not receiving provincial funding. So one of the things that we would want to encourage is that—and perhaps I will take this as an opportunity to do so for my colleagues—we want to have discussions with the province around developments, around making the kind of councils which we are, as community councils, stronger in terms of communities to be able to do that kind of lobbying.

Ms Zytaruk: I think there is increasing coalition-building among disparate groups, beyond just trying to respond to the tremendous inequities they are experiencing. I think one of the best public education tools has been the food banks. People see the people lined up at food banks and are seeing their neighbours, so there is this increasing awareness that things are not okay. There is that increasing awareness and need that the government needs to intervene, that the free market is not doing what people propose it can do.

The Chair: Okay, thanks very much. We will end there.

The next group is the Toronto Injured Workers' Advocacy Group.

TORONTO INJURED WORKERS'
ADVOCACY GROUP
ONTARIO NETWORK
OF INJURED WORKERS' GROUPS

Mr McKinnon: My name is John McKinnon. I work with a community legal clinic, Injured Workers' Consultants. I am here today on behalf of the Toronto Injured Workers' Advocacy Group, which is a group of legal workers from the community legal clinics in the Toronto area who work on workers' compensation cases.

Also with me today from the legal clinic system is Airissa Gemma, who is a community legal worker with the Industrial Accident Victims' Group of Ontario, and Karl Crevar, the chairman of the steering committee for the Ontario Network of Injured Workers' Groups, an umbrella group of injured workers' organizations from across the province.

Mr Chairman, I would like to thank you very much for agreeing to hear from us today. When I called yesterday to confirm, I was quite surprised to find out that I had apparently already called to back out of the presentation. But as you can see, that is not the case and we are pleased that you are going to hear from us. Our presentation will not take too long. We can complete our submission in 10 minutes and if there are any questions, that is fine.

We are pleased that the committee is taking a broad view of the constitutional issues and is prepared to consider the views of all people. Today we want to deal with one issue which from your perspective I am sure is a very narrow one on the constitutional scene, but we would like to talk to you about the way that we treat people with disabilities. Specifically, we would like to talk to you about the way that we treat people with workplace disabilities.

Now this, in terms of the issues that you have before you, relates to the values that we share as Canadians and to the roles that the provincial and federal government should play. We work with a group of people, like other minority groups, who have not been treated with the respect that they necessarily deserve. Much of Canada that we know was built by the hands of workers from many cultures and in the course of building the roads and the railways and the subways and the mines and the buildings, the factories, many workers were injured, many of them seriously. Many of them will never get back to work again and many of these injured workers are compelled to live in poverty. Canada has not treated these injured workers well.

As Canadians, we think that it is well established that we have a social responsibility for the disabled, and through the establishment of provincial workers' compensation boards, we have acknowledged a special responsibility of employers for people who are injured in the course of their employment. Federally, we have established disability benefits under the Canada pension plan but in creating this so-called safety net, we have left gaps so large that great injustices often result.

1500

We want this committee to be aware that the federal and provincial systems are not well co-ordinated and this is a particular problem for injured workers. Furthermore, we want the committee to be aware that there is no legal consensus about non-discrimination on the basis of work-related disabilities. Provincially, in the Ontario Human Rights Code, we find that "handicap" is defined to include a disability resulting from a workplace injury and covered by workers' compensation. The federal human rights code and the Charter of Rights are not so clear. In addition to this, we are finding that federal employers whose workers are covered by the provincial workers' compensation boards are now taking the position that improvements in workers' compensation coverage such as the re-employment provisions in the current Workers' Compensation Act are not applicable to the workers of federal employers. We would like to see a consistent federal and provincial approach to people with disabilities, and specifically to people with work-related disabilities, and we would like to see provincial workers' compensation coverage for all the workers who are employed in this province.

We would like to comment on a couple of specific problems, something which you may not be aware of. The Canada pension plan discriminates against the disabled. Other benefits under the Canada pension plan are available any time after the contributor has qualified, but disability benefits have to be applied for within roughly five years of ceasing to work, or you lose them. That is not the case with, say, the death benefits or survivors' benefits. If you

house was to die tomorrow, or yourself, and your spouse as not aware of the benefits, they can be applied for 10 years down the road, or whenever. Once you have qualified, you can get them; the same, for example, with the old age security. Once you have made the contributions and you have hit age 55, 60, whatever, you can take it whenever you want it. You can take it at age 65, you can take it at age 70. You do not lose it once you have made the contributions and hit the basic qualifying requirements.

But it is different with disability benefits and this is unfair in particular for injured workers. As you, I am sure, are aware, many injured workers with serious disabilities struggle for years in establishing their claims at the compensation board and they are completely consumed by that task, to keep their workers' compensation entitlement. Finally, after some period of years, they are dumped on to a small pension and they find they cannot live on what the Workers' Compensation Board pays them, so they look to the Canada pension plan disability pension. But they are denied because they have not been earning income and making contributions for the years that they have been fighting with their workers' compensation claim. Even if an injured worker tried to make contributions to the Canada pension plan out of his or her temporary total or temporary partial disability benefits, that would not be allowed. It is not permissible under the terms of the legislation, so there is no way out. A federal-provincial co-ordination could ensure that while an injured worker is on compensation provincially he or she is not running out of entitlement to a disability pension federally. These delays arise in a number of circumstances.

Ms Gemma, who has been representing injured workers for the past 10 years, can give you a clearer appreciation of how injured workers can be delayed in their applications for Canada pension plan.

Ms Gemma: Oftentimes when a worker becomes injured, there is an expectation that he or she will eventually return to some form of gainful employment. When they are on compensation, they usually are involved in a rehabilitation program where the expectation is for them to return to work. They are not encouraged by the compensation board employees to apply for Canada pension until the realization that their injury is going to be permanent and they cannot get back to work. They finally realize that the limitation period has run out, the five years; the five-year period has expired. They are also told by some board employees and by some advisers that if they do apply for Canada pension disability benefits it may interfere with their compensation benefits. This is just not the case.

It used to be, if a worker was involved in a rehabilitation program with the compensation board, he or she would be entitled to a supplement. If at the same time the same worker would apply for Canada pension, the supplement portion of his payment would be affected; that is, he or she would be denied the supplement. So that was the case a few years ago.

The other line workers are getting is that if they receive Canada pension now and return to work at some point in the future, they risk the chance of receiving Canada pension again if they should need it in the future. It is not the

fault of the board particularly; it is the fault of the system that injured workers, by the time they realize they are not going to be able to get back to gainful employment, are usually out on a limb and cannot go back and ask for Canada pension.

Mr Crevar: Just to give an example of how injured workers fall into this trap, I will use my own scenario. I was injured back in 1983. I returned to work for an additional four years, and I had to go off work in 1987. Since then, I have applied for workers' compensation. I am still awaiting a claim, by going through the workers' compensation system, and, dealing with other injured workers, I know what they are going through because I am going through the same process. At what point in time, not knowing whether my claim is going to be accepted, do I request for a Canada disability, and, with all the pros and cons within the system, whether I am entitled to it or not?

There are a number of injured workers in this province, as well as across Canada, who are running into that same scenario, and this is an area that must be addressed and must be addressed quickly and clearly so that the workers can be compensated in that regard.

Mr McKinnon: I can tell you, even the workers who are careful enough to go out and apply for Canada pension plan disability as soon as they have their accident often find themselves out of luck too. I could give you specific examples of injured workers who have, because they applied soon after their accident, been told by Canada pension plan: "I'm sorry, you're not disabled enough. Surely you'll be able to get back to some kind of work," and they accept that. They are not people who have grown accustomed to fighting the government and fighting the system. They fill out the application and make an honest effort. They apply and are told, "No, you don't qualify," and that is it, they go away. Five years down the road, when their workers' compensation benefits are reduced, again, they cannot get the Canada pension plan. They have not appealed their decision within the time limit, and they are out of luck.

The other aspect we wanted to point out to you is that the Workers' Compensation Board takes an illegal approach to Canada pension plan benefits. Under the new wage loss compensation system of the Workers' Compensation Act, a worker with Canada pension plan disability benefits will be deemed to have income both from the Canada pension plan disability pension and from the wages that would be paid in work the board considers suitable and available. This is legally wrong in a couple of ways.

First, Canada pension plan disability and working are mutually exclusive. If you can work, you do not get Canada pension plan disability benefits. The CPP pays either full benefits or nothing. There is no partial disability under the Canada pension plan. The Workers' Compensation Board in Ontario ought not to be deeming injured workers to be doing something that is illegal under the Canada pension plan in order to save money on workers' compensation benefits.

The second aspect which, in our submission, is illegal in the approach taken by the Workers' Compensation

Board is its attitude towards people on Canada pension plan disability pensions. The Canada pension plan disability pension is payable to people who are unable to engage in gainful employment permanently, or at least for a prolonged period of time. Once their doctors have made this determination and the Canada pension plan doctors have agreed with it, it is unrealistic and unfair for Workers' Compensation Board adjudicators to be considering them to be earning income from jobs the compensation board thinks might be suitable and available.

From the perspective of the injured worker, he is being pushed and pulled by the government at the same time. One government is saying they will never work again, the other government is saying there are suitable and available jobs out there, and simply by some provincial acknowledgement, some provincial respect for the decision under the Canada pension plan, this dilemma could be avoided.

1510

I also wanted to mention the case where some Canada pension plan benefits can properly be considered income for the purpose of the wage loss benefits, but the Workers' Compensation Board does not take into account the fact that the Canada pension plan is partly funded through employee contributions; in that way, part of the benefits the workers receive are the same as private insurance they purchased on their own. The compensation board does not take into account privately purchased insurance benefits when it is calculating an injured worker's wage loss, so it ought not to take into account the portion of the Canada pension plan disability benefits that are paid for by the worker's own contributions. That is the nub of the problem, and perhaps I will let Mr Crevar wrap it up.

Mr Crevar: I would like to point out that there was an agreement made back in 1914, 1915. That was the establishment of the Workers' Compensation Board, and it was established to provide a no-fault insurance scheme. What we have seen over the years is that for the worker who is injured or disabled in the course of his employment, compensation has been drastically reduced, and more recently, as I am sure you are aware, Bill 162, which was implemented in 1989. In many cases, as my colleague Mr McKinnon has pointed out, the deeming factor is being used. I still do not understand how you can deem a job that is not there. I really do not understand that.

Just to conclude: All people with disabilities deserve greater care and respect than our laws presently provide. The workers who lost their health or their lives in the process of building this country should not be forgotten. In a lot of cases they have been. You may have thought there were organizations in place that take care of injured workers. While we do have organizations that try to address the needs, the reality demonstrates that there are some gaps that have tragic consequences. In many cases, the lack of consistent, co-ordinated support for injured workers dumps them into poverty. This, again, is the limited pension that is awarded and the insufficient compensation benefits they are getting, which puts them into the poverty category.

Injured workers and disabled people are reduced to a small pension by the WCB, which becomes too late to

qualify for the CPP disability. They in turn, through the whole process, lose their homes, their dignity and often their families, and in a lot of cases, I am sure you have read in the past, have even lost their lives in the form of taking their own lives.

There is a very clear problem, one that can be resolved by the federal-provincial arrangements, and we hope the committee will take a good look and take some action on this matter. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much for the presentation. While we may not be able to address the specifics of the problems you brought before us, I think it is useful for us to have that perspective so we can make sure that that is addressed in relation to all of the other issues we are dealing with.

We are almost at the time. There are two people who have questions. If we can do both answers and the questions very quickly, we can try to get through them.

Mr Bisson: Mine is basically just a yes or no answer. I am not going to get into any explanation of the situation. You said in your brief that one of the things you see as a possibility is that the workers' compensation system would be a federal program. Is that what you are advocating?

Mr McKinnon: No. We are advocating—

Mr Bisson: Okay. I understood you to say that, and was just wondering if that would not create a bigger monster than we already have now.

Mr McKinnon: I think so.

Mr Harnick: I have had some experience prosecuting actions on behalf of injured workers at the Workers' Compensation Board. One of my observations, having done many of them, is that because legal aid is not available, there are so many people who have to go there and are essentially unrepresented, that the system breaks down because of it, or certainly people feel they are not getting their day in court, so to speak. Have you had any discussions with the Attorney General or with some of the workers' compensation people, the Ontario legal aid people, to see about extending the legal aid plan to cover workers' compensation?

Mr McKinnon: There are two parts to that. On the legal aid plan, the legal aid plan in some cases will give certificates for appeals of workers' compensation cases; now, on the basis of a legal opinion. The legal aid plan does fund community legal clinics such as ours, but the demand is far in excess of what we can cope with. On that note, Mr Crevar has had some experience with trying to expand the system.

Mr Crevar: We are approximately 20 injured workers' groups in Ontario. We are attempting to establish funding so we can service the injured workers in that respect, service them through the system itself to assist them. I do not know whether you are aware, but the last figure I have is that there are approximately 500,000 cases of injuries reported in a year. Some of those cases that were reported, I believe 120,000, are on permanent pensions. So there are many people caught in the middle, and to date there are people who should have been compensated properly who

were not, and we are trying to establish the funding through any process so we can service them.

Mr Harnick: I hope you are successful.

Mr Crevar: So do we.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

CANADIAN PARENTS FOR FRENCH (ONTARIO)

The Chair: I call next Canadian Parents for French?

Mrs Finlay: Thank you very much. My name is Jan Finlay. I am the president of Canadian Parents for French (Ontario).

Some of you have heard the Canadian lightbulb joke, 'How many Canadians does it take to change a lightbulb? None, because Canadians like things the way they are.'

There is no truth to that joke these days. Canadians do not like things the way they are. The truth is that there has never been any truth in that joke. Canada started because Canadians did not like the way things were. It has changed and evolved because Canadians, from MPPs to Canadian Parents for French (Ontario), are willing and are able to change the way things are.

Canada will continue to change and evolve. Today, we hear discussion about regionalism, the division of powers among federal, provincial and local governments, topics more of interest to lawyers and constitutional experts than to anyone else. Underlying the quarrelling, the argument and the debate we are hearing today is a sense of hopelessness, a sense that Canada has never worked and never will work. That hopelessness, that sense of tired resignation to a fate that cannot be controlled, is new and suggests that Canadians either do not know or have lost sight of their own history.

We Canadians seem to have forgotten the origins of our nation. At Confederation in 1867, Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia joined together to create a nation. The odds against that nation succeeding were immense. The four provinces were lightly populated, had little in common, were separated by language, by culture and by religion. What brought them together was, in the words of George-Etienne Cartier, the knowledge and determination that by joining together we could become a great nation.

To those who say Canada does not work, I ask: Is Canada not one of the most prosperous nations in the world? Is Canada not one of the freest nations in the world? Is Canada not one of the most decent, most tolerant nations in the world? Is Canada not one of the best-governed nations in the world?

It is no accident that Canada has become one of the most envied nations in the world. It has happened because men and women had a vision, a vision of a country that was united, which was far more important and far better than all the things that might divide it. It was a wider vision, a vision of a country that was stronger than its petty quarrels about divisions of power, a country that was stronger than bickering about whether there should be one or two languages on a box of cereal.

Since the 1860s, generations of Canadians have kept faith with that wider vision. Today, there are thousands

upon thousands of Canadians who have a wider vision of Canada and who are working to make that vision a reality.

1520

Canadian Parents for French is an organization of men and women who believe in tolerance, understanding and mutual respect among Canadians. We recognize and support French and English as Canada's two official languages and we believe young Canadians should have the opportunity to become bilingual in French and English. Canadian Parents for French and Canadian Parents for French (Ontario) work voluntarily to promote educational opportunities for young Canadians to learn the French language and to create and to promote opportunities for young Canadians to use the French language. Our primary focus is French as a second language.

We are neither francophone nor anglophone. We are neither bilingual nor unilingual. We are Canadians united in a wider vision of Canada as a country of two official languages, a nation tolerant enough to support a linguistic duality and a nation young enough and daring enough to achieve it.

On a more personal level, we believe, with Canadian author Antonine Maillet, that learning another language makes you bigger, gives you a wider vision and makes you feel subtleties you do not feel in just one language.

We believe that stronger communities across the country in both official language groups will enrich the country culturally and in other practical ways. If we can share two languages, we can grow stronger together. In pursuit of that strength, in 1988 Canadian Parents for French (Ontario) started a special campaign to promote community awareness of Ontario's provincial legislation providing services in French. We have actively and successfully campaigned against the efforts to have municipalities declare themselves unilingually English.

Our wider vision of Canada is shared. In the fall of 1989 an Environics poll showed that 74% of people in Ontario want their children to learn the other official language. In Toronto alone, support for that second-language education reached 81%. Across Canada, more than one million young people are learning French as a second language in schools. More than 124,000 of these young people attend 845 schools across the province offering core French and French immersion. Immersion is not an easy choice, but it is a choice.

We believe Canadian families express their vision for the future through the choices they make for their children. Outside these committee hearings, away from Parliament and legislatures and forums, Canadian parents and their children are choosing a unique Canadian future, one based on a vision that is our heritage from Confederation.

Canadian Parents for French (Ontario) works to make French a living, vital part of the lives of students who have chosen this wider vision. Every year, with the Ontario Modern Language Teachers' Association, we co-sponsor the Ontario Concours d'art oratoire, a French-language public speaking competition. Across Canada, more than 55,000 young Canadians, from grade 2 up, compete in class, school, board, regional and provincial and territorial speak-offs. Every spring, 60 secondary school finalists

take part in Le Festival, a weekend gathering at which these young anglophone and francophone Canadians share their thoughts and concerns and hopes for the future of their country, using French as the language of communication.

In the past three years, hundreds of students have taken part in Canadian Parents for French (Ontario)'s Rendez-Vous program. During these weekends, anglophone and francophone students in grades 7 and 8 from across Ontario get together to have fun in French and to bridge the gulf between the two cultures.

Throughout Ontario and throughout Canada, there are countless summer camps, book fairs, concert series, plays, films and activity days in French, organized and run by CPF volunteers.

I have talked today about a wider vision of Canada. I have not used the phrase "wider vision" by accident. It is the title of a video produced by Canadian Parents for French and TVOntario. A Wider Vision shows Canadians taking part in these activities and living Canada's heritage of linguistic duality, in full, every day. I have brought a copy of the video to leave with you that you may peruse at your own leisure. It is wonderful. It shows kids, adults, everybody working towards living in French.

These young Canadians and thousands like them share and live the wider vision of the 1860s, the wider vision of a nation that is greater than the sum of its diverse and varied parts. They share the wider vision of parents who volunteer their time to make the promise of linguistic duality a reality.

Listen to the young people who speak to this select committee and to other committees and commissions studying Canada and its future. They are positive about Canada's future. They share the daring youthfulness that created a nation in the face of immense odds. They have an open-minded, open-ended view of Canada. They are the leaders of Canada tomorrow, and they are already, today, telling us and showing us that they are committed to the idea and the ideal of a nation of Canada, a nation, "*Ad mari usque ad mare, d'un océan à l'autre.*"

We have a responsibility to their future and to Canada's future. Let us not shirk that responsibility. Let us not play into the hands of those who, in D'Arcy McGee's words, were only concerned with their own insignificance. Let us continue with a wider vision that created Canada in the 1860s, which has sustained Canada and which will continue to be its strength.

Mr Beer: Thank you for your presentation. Let me reiterate publicly my thanks to Canadian Parents for French for all the incredible work it did last year at the time a number of municipalities were considering unilingual motions. Sometimes Canadians and Ontarians forget that for all those who did pass some form of unilingual bylaw, in fact there were many, more than 50 or 60, which have a variety of bylaws the other way that were expressing support for linguistic duality, and that was in large part due to the work your organization did.

We are also delighted to get a video. We now have two videos. In the last select committee, we had a rock video that was actually presented, but this, I am sure, will be well worth watching.

Mrs Finlay: It is calm and peaceful and shows part of the whole country.

Mr Beer: I wonder if you would share with us, in terms of the work you are doing in expanding the various programs for elementary and secondary kids for French immersion and various offshoots of that program, what are the challenges you now see. In a sense, the program is well launched, we are into the secondary school stage increasingly throughout the province, but what are the major challenges now before that program from the perspective of Canadian Parents for French?

Mrs Finlay: In terms of challenges we face this year we are looking at teacher shortage, making sure we have enough teachers to teach all of the programs. Not just immersion: We have to remember our core students and to make sure there are qualified core teachers out there to teach our children and to teach them well, to make French come alive in the classroom. As I look around the board table, I am quite sure that most of us here are products of the good old: "Here is the book. Read it." Now, you are 15 years old. Stand up in front of your peers and try and say what you have just read without any role models. We are trying to make sure those things do not happen. French can be alive in the classroom, and we are trying to make sure it does come alive in the classroom and that it comes alive after 5 as well.

The other issues we see right now are board reviews because boards are now taking a look at their program and trying to decide whether they have been successful in the things they have set out to do. Increasingly, it is becoming a wonderful thing, I think. The boards are finding out for themselves through these reviews that, yes, (a) immersion is working, and (b) the programs are financially viable, that they are not programs taking moneys away from other programs.

The other thing is to do outreach into some of the communities, through our book fairs and all of those activities, to bring French to the communities which do not have it. I live in Ottawa, so I have Utopia. I am very upset that I am only unilingual. I can only overhear half the conversations on the bus in the morning and it is really disappointing. I am working at becoming bilingual. I do not think I ever will be, but I would like to have at least a facility with the language.

My children and the children of those parents who belong to Canadian Parents for French are working towards being as bilingual as they wish. Bilingualism is a choice. We do have to remember that, and we just want to make sure that choice is there for those who want to choose that choice.

1530

Mr G. Wilson: You touched on my question, which was the outreach. Before I get to that, on page 2 you asked some questions that I think you mean to be rhetorical, but think they do have answers. In fact, we are getting them from many people who present here. When you ask, "Is Canada not one of the most prosperous nations in the world?" it might be true for a lot of people, but a significant number in our province do not feel it is as prosperous as some people think. The other question, "Is it not one of

le freest nations?" Again, it is still not free enough for a very large number of people in our province.

I am impressed with the hopefulness of your vision, but for those who do not share it, for the reasons that these questions in part address, how do you reach out? Is there something more you could say about how you can reach parents of kids in the community to encourage them to share your vision about the need for French-language instruction in the community and the benefits that can follow from that?

Mrs Finlay: We are doing the best job we possibly can with the funding available to us. As you realize, fiscally, everybody has a problem these days. Mr Wilson just came down and he really has a problem and consequently the rest of us will as well.

Through our bringing together of children, both francophone and anglophone Ontarians—I really hate to qualify those; I would prefer to think of everybody being a Canadian or being an Ontario-born person—we are showing the children that they are one and the same. Because one is francophone and one is anglophone does not change who they are in terms of being good or bad. They are kids.

It is going to be very difficult to change the attitudes of adults. I think you yourself will realize that you have certain attitudes, and no matter how much you and I may have a discussion in the hall, I probably will not change your decision as to how you stand on that issue. So we are working through our children because they are the leaders of tomorrow and they are the people who are going to be governing our country in 20 years. The people who are against the French language today by and large are adults, and they are adults who have reached the stage where no amount of outreach is going to change their attitude. In terms of showing tolerance towards the younger children, this is where we put our focus.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

MICHEL OUELLETTE

M. le Président : I call next l'Association de la jeunesse ontarioise.

M. Ouellette : Mon nom est Michel Ouellette. En fait, je suis ici à titre personnel et non pour l'APJO. Il y a eu confusion, apparemment. Je travaille pour le magazine *Click*, un magazine qui est parrainé par l'APJO et deux autres organismes.

Donc, c'est à titre d'individu que je me présente aujourd'hui devant cette commission. Je suis Franco-Ontarien, né à Smooth Rock Falls dans le nord de la province. J'ai beaucoup voyagé au Canada dans le cadre d'un programme d'échanges pancanadien. J'ai eu l'occasion de rencontrer des jeunes Canadiens de différents milieux et origines. Suite à cette expérience, j'ai été accueilli dans des familles en Nouvelle-Écosse, en Alberta et au Québec. Ces voyages et rencontres ont contribué à ma compréhension du Canada et de ce qui nous unit et de ce qui nous divise.

Dans le document de discussion Changement et renouveau, invitation à parler d'un nouveau Canada, vous proposez plusieurs sujets de discussion. Bien que tous ces sujets soient importants, je crois que la question linguistique nécessite une plus grande attention parce qu'elle

constitue une véritable menace d'écèlement au pays. Cette question sera donc au cœur de ma présentation.

Cependant, je crois fermement que nous devons agir dans les plus brefs délais et avec un esprit de respect en ce qui concerne les revendications des peuples autochtones. Les événements de l'été passé à Oka ont souligné notre ignorance et notre incompréhension au sujet des revendications territoriales autochtones. Pour moi, ce conflit armé m'a forcé à repenser ma vision de l'histoire du Canada et ma vision du Canada actuel. À qui appartient le Canada ? Les peuples autochtones sont les grands oubliés. Nous devons corriger cette situation.

Je vous offre quelques suggestions. Peut-être devrions-nous réapprendre notre histoire et mieux tenir compte des contributions des peuples autochtones à l'évolution du Canada. Il faudrait aussi que cette réalité que des peuples vivaient sur le territoire actuel du Canada avant l'arrivée des Européens soit reflétée plus concrètement dans nos institutions nationales. Présentement, nos institutions reflètent plutôt nos liens avec le Royaume-Uni. Peut-être devrions-nous remplacer le sénat par une Chambre des peuples autochtones. Peut-être que le gouverneur général du Canada devrait être un représentant des peuples autochtones. Symboliquement, ça soulignerait la présence des peuples autochtones dans notre gouvernement. Ce symbole est peut-être plus juste que celui d'un représentant du pays colonisateur. Quoi qu'il en soit, il faut aller au-delà du symbolique et démontrer concrètement notre volonté de reconnaître la situation spéciale des peuples autochtones et de contribuer à l'épanouissement de leurs communautés.

Pour ce qui est du multiculturalisme, je crois que nous devons augmenter les échanges entre les groupes ethnoculturels. Nous devons promouvoir l'intégration de ces groupes à la culture canadienne et il faut éviter les ghettos culturels. Il est normal que les membres de groupes ethnoculturels se rassemblent pour s'entraider et maintenir une identité qui leur est propre. Mais il faut favoriser la participation de ces groupes aux groupes majoritaires ; il faut briser les barrières entre les groupes.

Si je reviens à la question linguistique, c'est un problème épineux et douloureux pour plusieurs. Pour moi c'est une question à laquelle j'ai été confronté dès le secondaire. En effet, c'est à ce moment-là que j'ai pris conscience des injustices commises envers les francophones hors Québec. Chez nous, il a fallu qu'on se batte pour obtenir des cours en français. Les francophones constituaient plus de 60% de la population étudiante de l'école secondaire. Cependant, on n'avait droit qu'à 30% des cours en notre langue. Ça se passait en 1977. Aujourd'hui la situation a changé. La communauté franco-ontarienne s'épanouit. Nous avons deux conseils scolaires et un collège de langue française. Il y a aussi la chaîne française de TVOntario. Il y a plusieurs organismes et institutions voués à l'épanouissement de la communauté franco-ontarienne, et nous avons aussi la Loi sur les services en français, la Loi 8. Il faut se réjouir de ces acquis.

Cependant, certains groupuscules en Ontario voient ce développement de mauvais œil. On soupçonne les francophones de vouloir par des moyens détournés usurper le pouvoir anglophone. «Bilingual today, French tomorrow»,

pensent-ils. On aime comparer la Loi 8 aux lois 101 et 178 du Québec. Ce sont bien deux choses très différentes. Une comparaison de la communauté anglo-québécoise et la communauté franco-ontarienne illustre très bien l'écart entre ces deux minorités. Je ne veux pas défendre les lois québécoises ici, je préfère défendre la loi ontarienne, mais à mon avis l'Ontario devra faire plus pour la communauté franco-ontarienne. À quand la pleine gestion de nos institutions scolaires ? À quand l'université franco-ontarienne ? À quand les autres collèges de langue française ?

À ceux qui s'offusquent de voir le Québec affirmer son caractère distinct et qui s'empressent de parler des efforts en matière de bilinguisme en Ontario, je réponds que l'Ontario est toujours une province officiellement anglaise. Oui, il y a beaucoup d'anglophones qui apprennent le français et qui le parlent. Il y a aussi bien des Québécois francophones qui apprennent la langue de Shakespeare.

L'indépendance du Québec, maintenant. La façon dont je vois l'évolution du pays est que le Québec, depuis plus de 20 ans, transforme ses institutions et sa société de façon à les rendre plus représentatifs de sa réalité — c'est-à-dire que l'on parle français au Québec — tandis que dans les autres provinces on accorde des services et des institutions aux minorités francophones, souvent après des années de revendications, ou on abroge certaines garanties constitutionnelles pour l'usage du français. Le désir d'autonomie et de statut spécial du Québec est perçu comme une menace par les autres provinces dites anglophones. On ne veut pas reconnaître le caractère distinct du Québec. On accepte de le reconnaître seulement si on obtient les mêmes pouvoirs que le Québec et cela mènera possiblement à l'éclatement du pays.

Je crois qu'il est important que le Québec puisse défendre et promouvoir son caractère distinct. Je crois que le caractère distinct du Québec est un grand atout pour le Canada. La survie d'une culture française nord-américaine est une richesse dont nous devrions tous être fiers. Dans le même ordre d'idées, l'épanouissement des cultures autochtones est une richesse inestimable, tant pour le Canada que pour l'humanité entière.

Le désir d'indépendance des Québécois s'alimente dernièrement d'un sentiment de méfiance envers les anglophones du reste du Canada qui ne semblent pas comprendre les besoins, les aspirations du Québec et des francophones. L'image d'un drapeau brûlé et bafoué est devenu un symbole puissant, tout comme les déclarations d'unilinguisme anglais de certaines villes ontariennes.

Dans ce débat, deux visions du Canada s'affrontent : un Canada bilingue d'un océan à l'autre ; et un Canada avec deux grandes composantes, un Québec français et des provinces anglaises. Que se passera-t-il avec le Nouveau-Brunswick, la seule province officiellement bilingue ? Le premier cas semble utopique et irréalisable. Le second est la traduction de la réalité actuelle. Mais dans ce cas quelles seront les garanties pour les minorités tant francophones qu'anglophones ? Le réaliste et l'idéaliste se rencontrent. J'aimerais croire qu'on opèrera pour l'idéaliste. Il me semble que poursuivre un rêve est plus enrichissant.

1540

Et l'Ontario ? L'Ontario doit jouer un rôle de première ordre dans ce débat. À cause de l'histoire et de la géographie de notre province et du fait que l'Ontario est la province la plus peuplée, l'Ontario doit faire preuve de leadership. Ma suggestion : adopter le bilinguisme en Ontario, possiblement tenir un référendum en Ontario sur cette question. C'est risqué et dangereux mais si la population de l'Ontario se prononçait en faveur du bilinguisme, ce serait là un geste plus puissant que n'importe quel autre pour démontrer au Québec que les anglophones sont prêts à faire un pas pour rejoindre les francophones.

Si on décide de rejeter le bilinguisme, il faudra quand même que l'Ontario maintienne et améliore ses services à la communauté franco-ontarienne. Nous les Franco-Ontariens ne sommes pas en voyage dans la province. Nous sommes depuis des générations. Certes, la tenue d'un tel référendum fait peur. En tant que Franco-Ontarien j'y vois un débat qui voudrait essentiellement décider de mon droit d'exister à part entière dans la société ontarienne ou de vivre dans la pénombre et l'invisibilité. J'entends déjà les propos et je frémis d'indignation. Cette situation, je l'ai vécue à maintes reprises, notamment à Kapuskasing pendant le débat entourant la déclaration du bilinguisme de la ville. Pourtant, ne devrions-nous pas confronter directement les squelettes qui traînent dans nos garde-robes ? Un référendum n'est peut-être pas le meilleur moyen, nous convenons, mais le Québec nous y oblige presque. Le Québecois, en décidant de leur avenir, décide également de l'avenir du pays. À nous de poser des gestes aussi qui feront preuve de détermination et de courage.

En guise de conclusion, je voudrais simplement dire que toute cette remise en question du Canada suscite un débat nécessaire, mais le vrai défi sera de voir clair dans ce brouhaha collectif.

Je vous remercie de votre attention.

M. Beer : Merci pour votre présentation et surtout pour vos commentaires sur l'idée d'un référendum du point de vue des francophones de la province. Je pense que c'est la première fois qu'on entend parler d'un référendum sur le bilinguisme d'une telle façon. J'aimerais poser une question sur cet aspect.

Au Nouveau-Brunswick, comme vous l'avez mentionné, on a un système de bilinguisme officiel et là, au point de vue de la géographie de la province, c'est différent de notre province et aussi du Québec. Au Québec il n'y a pas de bilinguisme officiel mais quand même l'anglais a beaucoup de droit d'usage. En Ontario, encore une fois, c'est peut-être basé plutôt sur le territoire, avec une sorte de programme de districts bilingues, de régions désignées. Selon vous, l'importance pour l'Ontario de se déclarer officiellement bilingue, est-ce que c'est plus important que de continuer à développer les services sous l'égide de la Loi 8 ? Est-ce que le Québec va vraiment réagir à une telle déclaration, est-ce que ça a une importance pour le Québec ? On sait que faire cela va certainement causer d'autres problèmes. Mais pour développer la politique linguistique de notre province, quelle est la meilleure façon maintenant de procéder dans cette question ?

M. Ouellette : Je suis certain que dans certaines régions il y a de grandes concentrations de francophones ; la gion désignée c'est le cas. C'est vrai qu'à ce niveau-là le linguisme devrait être là de façon très concrète et très elle. Si j'amène la question du bilinguisme en Ontario, pour l'Ontario dans son ensemble, c'est peut-être ma naïveté, mais en grandissant je croyais vivre dans un pays bilingue. Il y a toujours cette dichotomie entre vivre dans un pays bilingue et vivre dans une province unilingue. À un moment donné il faudrait que les deux se rejoignent. C'est un peu ça. Je pense que si on accepte de vivre dans un pays bilingue, le pays est bilingue ou bien il ne l'est pas. Je pense que je ne peux pas tellement vous indiquer des façons d'articuler tout ça, mais je pense qu'il y a besoin d'avoir une reconnaissance plus grande du bilinguisme en Ontario. Je suppose que ça pourrait se limiter à certaines régions si on veut, mais je pense que c'est en termes d'articulation plutôt que de principes.

CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC JUSTICE

The Chair: I call next Citizens for Public Justice.

Mr Townshend: My name is Roger Townshend. I am a member of the board at Citizens for Public Justice, a national organization of citizens dedicated to promoting justice in Canadian public affairs. For the past decade, we have been involved in such issues as aboriginal rights, energy policy, the Constitution, the environment, human rights, socio-economic policy and social welfare policy. With me are Harry Kits, executive director, and Tim Schouls, who is a researcher at our organization. We have an opening statement which is going to be given by Mr Schouls and Mr Kits; Mr Schouls will begin.

Mr Schouls: Canada is at the crossroads. We confront our last opportunity to demonstrate mutual respect for the diverse peoples, regions and communities which make up Canada. Racism, regionalism and religious and ideological strife are rending the very fabric of our nation.

The violent events at Oka last summer bring into sharp relief the deep divisions which run through our society. As aboriginal peoples themselves have said to the Charest committee: "Aboriginal rights and peoples are not even given the benefit of preservation in either Meech Lake or in the New Brunswick additions. All we would get is a 'not affected' clause. That is not even assimilation. That is dismissal."

Canada's persistent constitutional neglect of aboriginal rights may well spell the cultural genocide of aboriginal people and the further dismemberment of Canada. As aboriginal peoples say, "If one sector of society is stripped of its right it now enjoys, then democracy and justice is threatened for all." Indeed, if we want Canada to be a nation that is strong and free, our task is, as Premier Rae stated, "to fight inequality, to promote justice and to guard against institutional arrogance and the abuse of power wherever we may find them."

A unified Canada hinges on whether we will deal justly with aboriginal nations. Doing justice to the aboriginal peoples must be our first step towards building political community in Canada. Aboriginal nations can contribute a great deal to our common understanding of how to live together in this country. We need to respect them. We need

to learn from them. We must not ignore them as we did in the previous constitutional discussions. Securing a rightful place for aboriginal nations will be the litmus test for whether we can generate mutual respect and responsibility among all Canadian citizens and communities.

In the Constitution Act of 1982 Canada committed itself to recognizing and affirming the existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada. We owe it to the aboriginal people to translate these words of wisdom into deeds of justice.

Accordingly, CPJ applauds the Ontario government's determination to make major strides in negotiating aboriginal self-government and in improving the quality of life of aboriginal peoples in Ontario. CPJ calls on the Ontario government to keep its promise to do everything possible for the sake of justice for all and a united Canada.

CPJ therefore recommends (1) that there be constitutional recognition of aboriginal peoples as a distinct, inherent and fundamental part of the country; (2) that aboriginal entitlement to self-government be constitutionally recognized and adequate resources be allocated to make self-government meaningful; (3) that the Ontario government take the lead in urging the other provincial governments and the federal government to make a priority commitment to a fair negotiation of aboriginal self-government, and (4) that aboriginal peoples be treated as bona fide partners in this constitutional process.

1550

Mr Kits: Canadians are proud that this country has not become a melting pot but has maintained its multicultural character. Indeed, the charter itself states that it "shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canadians."

The key challenge, therefore, is how we will do justice to the diversity among Canadians. We must recognize that different peoples have different beliefs and wish to live in different ways. We need to find political and legal means to encourage and promote mutual respect and mutual responsibility. If there is the political will to protect such diversity, we will also find a political way.

In CPJ's guidelines for Christian political service, we declare that governments must not only protect the rights of individuals but also those of communities, whether they are faith-related, geographical, occupational, cultural or lingual. Governments must protect and promote the ability of such communities to exercise their own responsibility and prevent oppression by others. Such government protection requires more than merely allowing people to think as they like. It also requires providing essential resources for allowing people to act on their beliefs as distinct communities, providing their actions do not violate other peoples' legitimate rights or harm the public interest.

Canada must respect differences and support their institutional expression. For example, we already have worker co-ops, housing co-ops and alternative schools which think differently about how to run a business enterprise, how to develop good neighbourhoods and how to educate children. We should encourage the emergence of these groups through tax incentives, grants and other means, to make it

possible for them to make their particular contribution to the economic, social and cultural life of Canada and Ontario. This would be one example of doing justice to the plurality of values that people possess within Canada.

In an address to the Ontario Human Rights Commission, William Davis, then Premier of Ontario, stated: "Pluralism, tolerance, diversity and understanding are not burdens upon the shoulders of this country, nor upon the shoulders of Canadians. They are part of what being Canadian is all about." Citizens for Public Justice fully agrees.

The challenge is to develop a political framework and a constitutional arrangement that entrenches the rights and encourages the development of distinct communities. Each can then make its contribution to the emergence of a dynamic society in which differences are cherished because they strengthen the entire mosaic.

Canada has made a starting point in this regard by enacting the equalization and regional disparities clause of the Constitution Act in 1982. Despite what appears to be an erosion of this commitment by the federal government in this week's budget, we believe this commitment should be strengthened and broadened to include non-geographic distinct communities.

CPJ is concerned first of all that the principle of mutual respect and mutual responsibility be accepted. Together, we must find ways of structurally implementing these principles on the basis of Canada's obligation to do public justice for all.

CPJ therefore recommends that your committee's mandate be expanded for the second stage of your work to include developing options for responsible political and legal responses to the many differences in values, beliefs, institutions and practices that are present in our country. We raise these basic human rights issues out of our commitment as Christians to public justice for all. We will expand on them in a brief we will be submitting later this week.

In conclusion, we quote from our aboriginal fellow Canadians: "This is a country of diverse peoples and cultures, and we must all find a home in Canada. For many Canadians, this country is a land of choice. For aboriginal peoples, it is our sole homeland on earth—we have nowhere to go. Aboriginal peoples merely insist that we be allowed to enter the circle of Confederation with honour and dignity. We cannot accept being hostages any more."

For Citizens for Public Justice this fundamental challenge by aboriginal peoples is the litmus test of Canada's commitment to mutual respect and mutual responsibility. To the degree that Canada recognizes and affirms the aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples, to that degree Canada will also demonstrate its willingness to offer similar respect to other communities that make up the Canadian mosaic. Justice denied to some in Canada is justice denied to all.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr Eves: On page 2 of your brief you make, I think, a rather interesting comment with respect to Canada respecting differences in support for institutional expression, and you go on to talk about worker co-ops, housing co-ops, alternative schools and "encouraging the emergence of these groups through tax incentives, grants and other

means." I wonder if you would like to expand upon that. How would you address or deal with the education system for example, in Ontario in the light of those remarks?

Mr Townshend: That is indeed a fundamental organizing principle of the philosophy in which we operate, encouraging this kind of structural diversity. Regarding education in particular, I will ask Mr Kits to address that.

Mr Kits: One of the things we have been heavily involved in is the education issue. As an organization, we are fully committed to looking for options for parents who want to choose alternatives within the public system or outside of the public system. We have been advocating a number of different kinds of policies with the Minister of Education. In fact, one of our colleagues is meeting with the minister this afternoon, asking for options which could be considered. They could be programs within the public school system around cultural and religious education, or alternative schools within the system which have some kind of fundamental religious or different pedagogical philosophy, or independent schools outside of the system. Personally, that is the choice I have made; my children go to a small independent school here in Toronto. One of the things we would be looking for is some kind of legal recognition that this is a responsible choice for parents to make in Ontario, and some kind of financial support as well, because right now we need to do that out of our own pockets as well as pay taxes to the public system.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for your presentation. I was interested when you were talking about human rights. Do you feel the human rights commission should be independent from government? And do you feel that if native rights are recognized in the Constitution then their rights will be improved?

Mr Kits: One of the ways of improving people's rights is to institute them in the Constitution—that is definitely one of the ways. What we are particularly concerned about in general, though, is a feeling that people have about each other, a mutual respect and a mutual responsibility for each other. Some of the structural ways of doing this are sometimes difficult to put in place right now and figure out right now. We certainly would want to see constitutional rights, particularly for aboriginal peoples and very distinctive communities. The human rights commission I think, has a very important role to play in making sure that a variety of communities can at least be heard, can put forward their case and can, perhaps, advocate for particular legislative or structural change which could occur.

The Chair: Thank you very much for the presentation.
1600

CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION—ONTARIO ASSOCIATION DU BARREAU CANADIEN—ONTARIO

The Chair: I call next representatives from the Canadian Bar Association.

Mr Manning: My name is Garth Manning. I am president of the Canadian Bar Association in Ontario. I am conscious of your time constraints and for that reason, if you can imagine any lawyer being brief, I will, to the best

of my ability, be brief. Certainly I will relieve the tedium of your reading the first two pages of our submission, because it merely tells you who we are, 16,000 members throughout Ontario, the objects for which we exist and what we do.

In your discussion paper, which naturally anyone appearing before you has carefully read, you pose eight specific questions, each complicated by itself and, together, complex and intertwined.

L'Association du Barreau canadien — Ontario considère qu'en raison de son effectif de plus de 16 000 membres, il serait impossible d'obtenir un consensus sur l'avenir du Canada permettant de représenter la position officielle de l'ABCO. Il est impensable pour vous, comme pour moi, de demander à 16 000 avocats et étudiants en droit ou même à leurs représentants élus au sein de l'association de se lancer dans un débat sans fin sur des enjeux compliqués et qui comporte bien souvent une forte charge émotionnelle.

À cet égard, les membres de l'ABCO ne sont probablement pas différents de ceux de tout autre segment ou groupe de citoyens de l'Ontario, voire du Canada, à l'extérieur du Québec. Il règne un sentiment de confusion et de frustration d'être apparemment incapable d'apporter une contribution personnelle, un sentiment de suspicion à l'égard des politiciens et des décisions prises sur un coup de dé dans des arènes auxquels la plupart d'entre nous n'avons pas accès et, probablement plus que toute autre chose, un sentiment d'incapacité à obtenir de sources sûres des renseignements fiables sur la raison d'être du Canada au cours des 123 dernières années et les répercussions des diverses options dont il faudra de toute évidence tenir compte au cours de 18 prochains mois.

Ainsi, chacun de nous doit composer avec ses frustrations, sa bonne volonté, ses préoccupations sincères et ses instincts mal informés. Cependant, la bonne volonté, les préoccupations et les instincts ne peuvent suffire et ne suffisent tout simplement pas.

Our parent organization, the Canadian Bar Association, which speaks for 38,000 lawyers, literally from coast to coast, has this year created a special committee. The mandate of that committee is to examine processes for constitutional amendment in Canada. In doing so, it will examine the experiences in other federal states, including various countries in Europe, in Australia, Malaysia and India. It will not focus on a formula for amending the constitution, but rather on the processes designed to ensure that proposed constitutional amendments embody the aspirations and political will of the nation. In doing this, this committee will provide a non-partisan source of legal expertise which will inform and stimulate national discussion and public awareness of constitutional issues. The six experts on that committee come from both academia and legal practice from across Canada, including Quebec, and their report is to be in early next year. Obviously, you would agree with me that such an initiative, while constructive, is what I would describe as a technical, lawyer-like approach.

At our organization in Ontario, our approach will be different. On our executive committee, we devoted one

recent special meeting to the discussion of the future of our country. In addition to that, we have had many informal sessions among our individual members. The overwhelming conclusion at this level is that there is a genuine and deeply held conviction that Quebec must remain in a changed Canada.

We decided that a resolution to the following effect be placed before our governing body, on whose authority we act, at its next meeting, which will take place on 5 April coming. First, we will institute a series of meetings between our members and our colleagues, particularly in Quebec, to exchange views, advance ideas and communicate, all in a constructive fashion.

Second, and probably more important, we intend to create a multidiscipline committee which will consist of two persons from each of the worlds of economics, political science, literature, the media, the business community and, if you can find any of them, constitutional lawyers who were not publicly involved in the Meech Lake debate. This committee, which has to report before the end of this current year, would concentrate on and analyse the perceived results, including economic, political, cultural and social, of every possible scenario which faces our country, from maintenance of the status quo to the worst possible scenario, which would be outright Quebec independence without economic association.

Clearly, the first part of what we propose to do is dialogue at the grass-roots level; the second to assemble non-partisan information through a respected, capable and unbiased source on the perceived results and nuances of every possible constitutional alternative, and to place that information and those results not only before our 16,000 members but also, through them and through our association, before the entire public in Ontario. Only with such facts can residents of this province understand the issues and the various combinations of circumstances which would result from any one of them. An informed legal profession and an informed public obviously will have influence on their politicians on the manner in which the next 18 months are approached.

I emphasize, as I have done in my brief, that the contemplated steps we are proposing to take are subject to ratification by our governing body at its meeting next month.

Pour les raisons expliquées plus haut, l'ABCO n'a pas et ne peut avoir une position commune qui me permettrait de vous donner une réponse unanime à vos questions. Toutefois, si je perçois correctement le sentiment de l'ensemble de nos membres, bon nombre d'avocats croient fermement que c'est notre dernière chance de modifier la constitution, qu'il serait souhaitable que le Québec demeure au sein du Canada, qu'il faudrait renégocier la constitution et qu'il faut à tout prix tenir compte des points suivants.

The time is now, and is spurred by the Allaire report—which of course you have all read—and doubtless by the results of the Bélanger-Campeau commission to follow at the end of March, which may make the Allaire report look almost tame by comparison. Change in Canada, as we know it now, is inevitable and it must occur. It is not impossible to reconcile the aspirations of Quebec, of the

Prairies, of the west, of the Maritimes and of this magnificent province, but the process must be visible. Past differences must be left behind. In the words of the Christmas song that many of us here sing at a certain time of year, there can be no reciting of a ledger of who is naughty or nice, and certainly no endless recall of who did what to whom since 1867 or, indeed, since 1763. It is 1991, and our country is in peril and the time is very short indeed.

It is, I respectfully submit, vital that responses outside Quebec to the Allaire report not be hostile or overemotional. Rhetorical excesses on all sides must be avoided. It is to be made clear to Quebec that there is no homogeneous English Canada which has rejected, with the failure of Meech Lake or in any other way, the arrangements contemplated by that accord. We will all remember that governments representing more than 90% of the population of Canada ratified Meech Lake. It failed, for whatever reasons, because of one member of a Legislature and because of one Premier of a province. It is convenient for certain Quebecers to say they have been rejected by English Canada—convenient, but it is just not true.

I suspect that many members of my association would subscribe to the view that it is possible to negotiate, and that negotiation would include a redivision of federal and provincial powers, a recognition and protection of minority and multicultural realities, a new deal for our native people, the preservation of the Supreme Court of Canada and of a reformed Senate—whether it is triple E or not is not germane to this particular topic—and the maintenance of a Charter of Rights common to the entire country.

1610

The public perception of lawyers is of a dull bunch; we are always, apparently, endlessly arguing technical points, arcane language and punctuation. While some of what my parent association and my own association is doing or proposing to do might be regarded as technical—although, of course, it leads to hard information for public consumption—do not, please, in hearing my submission, overlook either emotion or a real love of our country, both of which we share with our fellow countrymen and women and which, in the traditional Canadian way, it is not easy either to confess or to articulate.

To intrude a personal note, I myself am an immigrant whose first language happens to be English, and I have always resented and deeply still resent the anglophone and francophone labels which are so facily bandied around as if every Canadian was born here and had to be one or the other. Since I arrived 35 years ago I have never been able to understand, and still today do not understand, the bigotry which exists on both sides of the Ottawa River, the hostility of certain groups with narrow-minded views, the failure to appreciate the obvious, that at least two languages and cultures broaden the mind, and the obvious fact that in this country we have a decent, democratic and mostly gentle Canada which is widely envied elsewhere. I do not believe there is any way at all to prevent Quebec's wish for more political autonomy, and outside Quebec we would indeed be foolish to underestimate its deep feelings and its will.

Since the failure of Meech Lake just eight short months ago, relations have deteriorated almost to indifference born of irritated ennui on all sides. Some outside Quebec just want it to go away; others believe there is no problem, or one easy to solve. History has shown, and I have given you some examples, that it is a common reaction in circumstances like we are faced with to deny it exists or just fail to face up to a real crisis. If indeed Quebec became an independent country, it will destabilize in my respectful view, all of North America north of the 49th parallel. We in this province would be about one half of an abbreviated Canada's population, and we would represent a large chunk of its power and representation in Parliament. How would this be accepted in the west and in the Maritimes? And an independent Quebec would have its own problems, not only with its native population, who might not accept secession, but also internationally and with the rest of us.

Thus, the only alternative is to recognize the critical problems, openly to negotiate a much-changed Canada, for which the Allaire report provides only a point of departure—and let us not deceive ourselves; the Allaire report will be adopted next week at the Liberal convention in Montreal with very few changes, I suggest—and to retain Quebec within the new arrangements. Toughness will certainly be required, but heart, emotion and commitment must all play a part. Failure means disintegration; the only option to failure is reintegration, and for that, skills of a superlative quality are required on every side of the equation. Some of those skills are required of our government in Ontario and of its advisers.

I deeply hope your report will underline, if such be the case from what you have seen and heard over your last few weeks, that Ontario will work from commitment towards a changed Canada embracing Quebec and all of its other equally important constituent regions. While I cannot tell you that 16,000 lawyers and law students would endorse some of my clearly personal observations, my instinct tells me that many of them do and would.

I would like to finish, if I may, with something that is not in my submission but which may be found in the reports of this House in Hansard at the time of the Quebec referendum in 1980. If you are particular in looking it up, it was the evening sitting of Tuesday 6 May 1980. A then member of the Legislature had been referring to many of the reports which were then circulating and then he said, as quoted in Hansard: "I am equally tired with the tedium of the minutiae of constitutional debate among lawyers, political scientists and bureaucrats. Their logic is not the logic of politics." He went on: "The strength of Ontario may be the weakness of Confederation. We have our obligations in Ontario as well as our opportunities. We have our obligations to the east and to the west, but more particularly we have our obligations to the people of Quebec. I have faith," he said "that we will discharge them."

That member was a lawyer, and that member was the late Jim Renwick. It is not important that he was a member of any particular party. That had no significance at all. But it is quite obvious where he stood almost 11 years ago, and I hope everybody in this room and in the province will

outside this room pays heed to what he said with such advanced prescience at that time.

Quoiqu'ils n'étaient pas bilingues, j'ai fait aujourd'hui certaines de mes observations dans les deux langues officielles. Afin que je puisse bien saisir vos questions et vos réponses, je vous saurais gré de bien vouloir me les poser en anglais. Monsieur le Président, messieurs, mesdames, je vous remercie.

The Chair: I will allow at least one question, but let me first of all thank you for the presentation and also for the process that the CBAO is embarking upon. I think it is going to be quite useful to the members and certainly to all of us; I think the committee will be interested in following that process and getting whatever information comes out of that. That would be of use to us in our work, as a consequence.

Mr Manning: You can count on it.

Ms Churley: I think it is fitting that I get to be the one to ask the question here, because I am honoured to be representing Riverdale, which was, of course, Mr Penwick's riding. We are all very respectful and proud to have been represented by him, so I am pleased you quoted him.

What I wanted to ask you about is women's involvement in the process. You mentioned that you think one reason why Meech failed—and of course there are other reasons—is that aboriginals, disabled and women, as you know, in particular were, and felt, very left out of the process.

First of all, I know some women who are constitutional experts who are lawyers who swear they were left out of the process, who I might be able to recommend to you. But I wanted to ask you if you are considering that, because I think it is going to become a very important part of the process, that those people are involved in all aspects of the process from here on in.

Mr Manning: At the time of Meech Lake there were, as we all know, several constitutional advisers to many of the governments taking part. I know several constitutional lawyers who are women who were part of that process.

Ms Churley: I guess they are different from the ones I know.

Mr Manning: To that extent, they were as full a part as any other constitutional adviser who happened to be male.

In our association we do not differentiate. Of the 6,000 members, we have many men and many women. All of them take part to the extent they wish to. I can think of many of our members who do certain obligations within our association. In the many-faceted sort of work we do, I can think of some of our members who happen to be women who do it rather better than some of our members who happen to be men. I would like to think they come forward and volunteer on the basis of merit and not because of gender. But certainly, if the question you are asking me is whether within our association our women members are involved and are going to be involved in the process I have described, the answer is a very resounding, definite and truthful yes.

Mr Beer: As a non-lawyer on the committee, I can first of all assure you that as I look around at our Chair-

man, at Mr Winninger and Mr Harnick, they are scintillating and sometimes even imaginative—anything but dull. I just wanted to clarify that on the public record.

The Chair: We can quote you on that, Mr Beer.

Mr Winninger: Flattery will get you everywhere.

1620

Mr Beer: In your proposal for a series of meetings between your members and colleagues, particularly in Quebec, one of the things that has come before this committee is the importance of those other than elected representatives being involved and reaching out. Have you worked out how that is going to take place? I think it would be particularly interesting to us to know how you are planning to do that, because we have been looking at how in our second phase we might both encourage and get involved in a number of those kinds of programs looking at other major groups within society.

Mr Manning: We are already halfway there. I just came back yesterday from Regina, where the national CBA governing body was meeting for five days. There were as many representatives from Quebec as there were from Ontario—which is not unusual, I hasten to add. In the informal discussions as president of my branch, which I had with my counterpart from Quebec and his senior people, we talked about the very points I have submitted to you today. And on the question you are asking me, we have already started to make plans and will see if they come to fruition: a meeting of our respective governing bodies in an informal setting in the western part of Quebec in the fall of this year. Also we will see invitations going out from lawyers in different parts of Ontario to different lawyers in Quebec and vice versa to come and stay with individual families on an individual basis just to see how we each relate to each other. In many cases we will not know our guest. This, I think, will be healthy. So yes, the process is already under way.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Manning. We are going to have to stop.

ONTARIO TEACHERS' FEDERATION
FÉDÉRATION DES ENSEIGNANTES
ET DES ENSEIGNANTS DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: I call next the Ontario Teachers' Federation.

Mr Archambault : Merci, Monsieur le Président. Je suis Guill Archambault, président de la Fédération des enseignantes et des enseignants de l'Ontario. With me is Margaret Wilson, secretary-treasurer of the federation.

The Ontario Teachers' Federation represents 126,000 professional educators in the public education system of this province. Our membership comprises a well-educated segment of Canadian society, diverse in terms of ethnic background, domestic situation, personal values, religion, gender, language and political affiliation.

As an organization which is concerned with the provision of quality education, and which is founded and operates on principles of equity and equality, OTF has a direct stake in the current debate on national unity and its implications for education. OTF and its affiliates, in conjunction with teacher organizations throughout Canada, have devoted

sustained effort to the evolution of education policies and practices which will respond to the differentiated needs of all citizens.

The Ontario government has a crucial role, potentially the most influential role, in the political and constitutional discussions which will determine the shape and nature of Canada over the next period of time. The federation perceives this role in terms of proactive leadership and forceful advocacy, as opposed to reactions and responses to the positions and agendas of other political jurisdictions, provincial and federal. Ontario, by virtue of its population, economic and industrial strength and many other factors, is in fact one of the key agents either for constructive reconciliation or for positive change. This province cannot be inert or passive or choose to reserve its political options while events unfold.

For many Canadians, federal politics is not associated with representative government in the public interest or with concepts of probity, integrity or enlightened leadership, although numerous examples of such virtues can be found. The more common association is that the political process as it has evolved and currently operates is ineffective and corrupt, alienated from the citizens it purports to serve, and predominantly focused on the elections, party factionalism and the seizing and retention of power through whatever means will ensure success.

There is an almost desperate hope that leadership will emerge from those who enter public life which will combine vision, purpose and basic integrity, and that the political system itself will permit the duly elected representatives of the Canadian people to in fact represent them. That these representatives number a great many women and men of honesty and dedication is beyond question. The restoration of public confidence in the probity of governments and the political process is absolutely essential to the future of this country. It is equally essential to accord respect to and restore the confidence of the great majority of politicians, and their eventual successors, who view political life as a personal commitment to positive change, and who bring the integrity of their private lives into their political duties.

The Ontario government must demonstrate immediate and vigorous leadership. While its prime responsibility is to the citizens of this province, this responsibility cannot be met without reference to the impending debate on federal-provincial powers.

The grounds for that debate, and the negotiations which will follow, are already being prepared at the federal level, in Quebec and in other provinces. Whatever value is placed on the practicability of exclusive authority, or authority-sharing arrangements such as those in the Allaire proposal, it seems evident that each province should now be engaged intensively in establishing its own position on those issues and should be working co-operatively with other provinces to ensure that change does not proceed from bilateral deals between the federal government and any individual province. Ontario has the status and the capacity to insist on a clean and orderly process for discussion of whatever adjustments and redefinitions of authority are necessary to preserve Canada intact.

The federation's position is that the Ontario government should directly involve itself in the movement to maintain a united Canada, with all its present component parts. We take pride in Canada and in being Canadians and we believe the traditions and values which underlie the sense of Canadian identity still have force and validity although they have been put under serious strain over the last period of time and have been weakened on occasions by the actions of our political institutions.

La Fédération canadienne des enseignantes et des enseignants souscrit au concept d'un Canada qui soit constitué de manière à: premièrement, réserver à un corps législatif central, établi en moyen de consultation du corps électoral, les pouvoirs requis pour régler les questions qui touchent à l'ensemble du pays et notamment l'équité sociale et l'égalisation des chances; deuxièmement, garantir le maintien des droits fondamentaux collectifs et individuels; troisièmement, reconnaître la dualité linguistique découlant de la présence de deux peuples fondateurs ainsi que les droits spéciaux des autochtones; quatrièmement, reconnaître le caractère multiculturel de la société canadienne; cinquièmement, accorder aux provinces et aux territoires autorité et autonomie complète dans ce qui ne concerne pas l'ensemble du pays; sixièmement, mettre en place des mécanismes permanents servant à déterminer l'autorité dont relèvent des questions précises ainsi qu'assurer qu'il y ait délibération et collaboration dans les domaines de compétence concurrente ou dont la responsabilité est partagée.

The continuance of Quebec in the Canadian federation must be ensured. While many Canadians have accepted the inevitability of separation, it has not been absolutely established that Quebec is irrevocably set on that course: The Bélanger-Campeau commission has not reported; the Allaire report has not been debated by the Quebec government; referendum has not yet been held nor is likely to be in the near future.

1630

A stated position in the Allaire report is that Quebec remain, but under a radically revised system of federal-provincial authorities and powers. Questions of constitutional recognition and protection of Quebec's distinctiveness have not been set aside but await a better process than the Meech Lake failure. The issue for Ontario is not whether the shopping list proposed by Allaire is acceptable, but whether the concept is valid and whether Ontario's interests and those of the country as a whole would be better served through such a reordering. There is a case to be made for the two largest provinces co-operatively exploring federal-provincial powers, with an attached understanding that Ontario will continue to support Quebec's cultural-constitutional aspirations. Ontario could well be the determining factor in Quebec's ultimate decision. There is still time for Ontario to assume a more active and encouraging role in this process. We believe the leadership in this province is appropriate to the task.

The rights of Canada's aboriginal peoples are also reflected in federation policy. Their particular place within the Canadian Confederation and the wide range of persistent concerns associated with that place have been under consideration during the life of the country without satisfactory

olution. Aboriginal peoples must have a direct involvement in all political and constitutional discussions which affect their status and welfare. Special attention must be given to educational structures and opportunities, including the preparation of aboriginal teachers to manage and instruct in education situations. Opportunity should also be provided for access to social and legal counselling in every province. The process of addressing and resolving outstanding land claims must be greatly accelerated. In short, aboriginal people must have the full opportunity to define and develop a role in Canada which reflects their sense of tradition and culture and which gives them full equity with other Canadians.

Education in all its forms, and at all levels, is inextricably tied to the future of this country. Across the nation, the curriculum must be designed to develop a sympathetic understanding of our world, to promote a sense of national unity and interprovincial co-operation, and to inculcate an understanding and appreciation of the obligations, privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. The curriculum must be inclusive and reflect the roles and contributions of all Canadians, regardless of race, national and ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age or mental or physical disability. The process of equality-seeking and historical and contemporary analyses of inequality should be part of the curriculum. The value of both official languages to Canadian life and culture must be recognized.

Il devrait donc y avoir un office canadien de l'éducation financé conjointement par le gouvernement fédéral et les gouvernements des provinces et des territoires qui exerceraient les fonctions suivantes, entre autres : réunir, compiler et diffuser des renseignements à l'intention des autorités gouvernementales des provinces et des territoires ; promouvoir et appuyer un programme de recherches adéquates en éducation ; se tenir au courant des problèmes fiscaux et financiers touchant à l'éducation et donner des conseils aux gouvernements intéressés quant aux façons d'y remédier ; coordonner les activités éducationnelles des diverses autorités du gouvernement fédéral ; et finalement, élaborer une déclaration de principes communs en matière d'éducation partout au pays.

The federation is not disposed to comment in detail on the economic options which might be pursued by the Ontario government. The potential effects of free trade, globalization, the current recession, shifting monetary policies, the goods and services tax, large-scale emergency spending and the possibility of a separate Quebec, in conjunction with other factors, have created a complex and uncertain economic environment. We are aware of the urgent need to sustain a vibrant and competitive economic base if our people are to have meaningful work and the educational, social and health services they have come to expect.

L'objectif de première importance de l'enseignement public au Canada devrait considérer procurer à chaque personne, quels que soient les facteurs conditionnant ses besoins éducationnels, des chances égales de se réaliser au moyen de l'éducation. Un modèle de financement de l'éducation propice à la poursuite de ces objectifs devrait garantir, premièrement, une répartition des ressources financières et effectives en fonction des différents besoins

individuels en matière d'éducation, abstraction faite des frontières géographiques ; et deuxièmement, une grande mesure de liberté, de diversité et de souplesse en ce qui touche l'organisation et la méthode d'enseignement ainsi que la matière enseignée dans le but de répondre aux besoins individuels. Le fardeau fiscal du financement de l'éducation devrait être réparti en fonction de la capacité de paiement, et on devrait dépendre davantage de l'impôt progressif plutôt que de l'impôt régressif.

Education is an investment in our collective future. The sense of common heritage in the midst of our diversity, which is so necessary to nation-building, is nurtured in the classrooms and schoolyards of this country. Our children show their faith in Canada on a daily basis. Their optimism should inspire us to ensure that they have a country to value and share.

I thank you, Mr Chairman, and I hope you have some good deliberations and good luck.

The Chair: Thank you for a most comprehensive presentation, which I think underscores the quote you have inside your folder and the important role of teachers in our community. We do have a couple of questions. We will be able to get through at least one.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for this presentation. We have not had a lot of teachers' groups come before us. We have had several francophone teachers in various locations across the north, and they were very good briefs.

I just wondered if you used this document or if you know whether your teachers are using it in the schools. We had hoped they might, and I wondered if you, as a federation, had used it or found it helpful. Your brief is much broader, but I just wondered if you could respond to that question first, and then I have a very short other question.

Mr Archambault: Yes, we have your questions and we have looked at them. We prepared our brief as focused on education mainly, but the other affiliates and the teachers also had your questions.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Has the Canadian Teachers' Federation got this as one of its high-profile items on the agenda now? You just heard the lawyers coming before us and talking about a rather creative way in which they are interrelating or planning to interrelate. Have you got something like that going with the francophone teachers or the Québécois teachers? I ask that because in Cornwall the challenge was put to us that this would be one of the most important ways in which we, as a committee, and others within our province, could help to create a better atmosphere for whatever negotiations or discussions are going to have to take place in the very near future.

Mr Archambault: In Ontario, our affiliates have been discussing the committee's questions. As to the Canadian Teachers' Federation, it will participate in the Spicer commission and it will be sending kits to all the children across the country so, there will be some action taken in the classrooms of the country on the Spicer commission.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Maybe you can encourage some of them to do some work on our document, which I think is better.

Mrs Wilson: If I may, the reason we did not respond to the specifics of your document, which we found an interesting document, is that we would have needed a research team to work for a month to respond adequately. It is a very thoughtful document.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am glad you agree.

1640

Mrs Wilson: You did not give us a long time to respond. We would be happy to take a crack at some of the questions more precisely and submit to you in writing in later stages. That was a very demanding document to send out to people, and rightly so.

The Chair: We understand. Thank you very much for your presentation.

INTERCEDE

The Chair: I call next the group, the representatives from Intercede.

Ms Hernandez: The strength and the real power of a country is not really measured by the so-called articulate leaders or politicians, or by the size of the budget, but by how we treat one another, whether they are immigrants or on temporary permits in this country. One such sector is the foreign domestic workers. Intercede is an advocacy and service organization that works for and fights for the rights of domestic workers. It has a membership of 2,000 women, and they have paid their membership dues every year. At each monthly meeting, you can have 400 women gathered at Cecil Community Centre.

Basically, the presentation of Intercede will focus on two principles: human rights, and also the service and employment sector of the whole legislation that holds this country.

Intercede strongly believes that the issue of human rights or human rights legislation, statutes, and facilities and social services should be universal and should be on a federal basis. We do not feel it should be given to provinces to implement per se. We believe a strong, universal program would be better for each and every one of us.

In terms of immigration, the foreign domestic workers are the only known workers required to live in with their employers for two years or so until they get their landed status. In terms of employment, the domestic workers in most provinces, with the exception of Quebec and Ontario, are not covered by the Employment Standards Act. In terms of social services, they are not able to access to social services, language and skills-training programs.

We see the domestic workers as the temporary answer to the day care crisis of this country. We strongly feel, because of their position in terms of employment, in terms of their immigration status, if the day care problems are not resolved or solved by different levels of government, this certain condition will pit women against women.

We also strongly believe the wholeness of this country can only be viewed by its integrity and dignity, and we feel that, with the domestic workers, this has not been translated fully in terms of legislation and practice. Thank you.

Mr Offer: I have a quick question dealing with the domestic workers program. You said that only in Ontario and Quebec is it subject to the Employment Standards Act.

My understanding of the domestic service program is that—and I am not aware of the coverage by provincial ESAs—there is a certain limit in terms of dollars, which is stated by the federal government and must be carried through each province: For instance, a domestic coming in on the program must get at least X dollars, of which a certain amount is attributed to room and board. I really ask this question just for my interest's sake. Is it not that the domestic coming in under that program will at least have some protection across the country in terms of a minimum wage?

Ms Hernandez: No, they are not covered by minimum wage, which varies in different provinces; but you are correct in saying that a certain portion is deducted from the gross salary for board and lodging and food. However, because of the vulnerability of domestic workers, and because they live in with their employers, they work long hours and are not able to claim overtime.

Mr Offer: So the problem you are bringing up is to make certain that the employers keep in line with the amount of hours a domestic should work each week as opposed to extending it throughout the evening and things of this nature.

Ms Hernandez: We have been saying that for so many years—well, it is good to utter it again. It is not being practised consistently, but what I think is very important is to have a consistent application of this enforcement throughout the country and the different provinces.

Mr Offer: And you feel that this consistent application for the protection of domestic workers can best be served through federal legislation applicable from coast to coast to coast, basically, as opposed to province by province?

Ms Hernandez: On the condition that the federal legislation will pick the best legislation in the country. We do not want to have the poorest legislation applied to the particular sector. I just wanted to add too that domestic workers are not yet included in the Occupational Health and Safety Act of this province, and we hope they would be covered also.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

COUNCIL OF CANADIANS

The Chair: I call next the Council of Canadians.

Mr Adolph: My name is Robert Adolph. I am a professor of humanities at York University and on the board of directors of the Council of Canadians. The Council of Canadians is 20,000 strong across Canada, with several thousand members in the Toronto chapter, which I chair. Our main concern is with issues affecting Canadian sovereignty. I cannot claim to represent our official position on constitutional issues, as we are still at work developing one. From my four-year involvement in the council though, I feel confident that my views are typical of a majority of our members.

First, the council would like to express its thanks to this select committee for allowing us to speak before it. If we had had more of such democratic procedures when Meech Lake was being rammed through over our heads by the federal government, we might not be in the dangerous situation in which we now find ourselves.

Two tremendous issues have always dominated political discussion regarding the nature of our Canadian Confederation. The first is the relationship between so-called English Canada and Quebec. The commission has heard a great deal about this and related subjects already in the many briefs on issues affecting Ontario, such as bilingualism, economic and political relationships between Quebec and the rest of Canada, and so on.

The other great issue affecting Confederation has always been the relationship between Canada and the United States. Yet, speaking as a dedicated watcher of these hearings on TV—I would regard myself as a veritable select committee junkie, in fact—I have heard little about this question.

I am arguing here that the two issues are closely connected. They became, in fact, fatally intertwined on 22 November 1988, when Brian Mulroney and his Tories were re-elected, thereby ensuring the passage of the so-called free trade agreement. Two sorts of people greeted that event with great happiness. One, of course, were supporters of big business. The other were Quebec separatists. Their reasons were similar. Both realized that the FTA would indeed the entire economic agenda of the federal government represented a drastic surrender of government control over our destiny. The Tory program is the massive retreat from governance desired by both these groups.

Essentially, the FTA, the core of this program, is not really about free trade at all. Most trade with the United States was already tariff-free before the FTA, and the CATT agreements already gave us easy access into the global market economy. Rather, the FTA is a turning over of the control and planning of our resources and economy to large corporations, many of them foreign-owned. It gives foreigners, that is, Americans, virtually unlimited power to buy up our industries. No other country in the developed world allows nearly so much foreign control. In Europe they have a word for this surrender of sovereignty, and it is a term of contempt: "Canadianization."

550

Inevitably, this process has pulled our economy and culture south of the border, though not at all in the way the federal government intended. The federal government apparently thought, quite wrongly, that the FTA would open up a huge new market for Canadian business. With few exceptions, Canadians soon found out, however, that they could not compete against lower costs in the United States, as well as American trade barriers still in place despite the FTA. So Canadian industries have simply shut down and left Canada altogether, causing terrible job losses. This process will soon be accelerated if the FTA is extended to Mexico, with its \$3-a-day wages, no environmental controls or businesses to pay for, and so on.

No part of the country has been hit worse by all this than Ontario. Both premiers Peterson and Rae realized that the FTA represents an economic disaster for our province. Even worse, related federal moves are unravelling the east-west ties without which Confederation cannot exist. I have in mind the weakening or privatization of Via Rail, the Canadian Council, Air Canada, Petro-Canada, the CBC and Radio Canada International—anything, in fact, with "Canada" as part of its name. And this morning driving in to

work, I heard in Mr Wilson's budget—my God—they are weakening the RCMP. Heaven help us.

Our farm marketing boards, the basis of a national agricultural policy, are under heavy pressure and certain to be weakened or destroyed by "free" trade. Not only Confederation, but the very day-to-day quality of our lives will be undermined further by Bill C-69, which, no doubt to the delight of big business, will eventually eliminate federal assistance to social programs, leaving us not only with depleted services but no nationwide standards, and much worse is yet to come.

The forthcoming negotiations required by the FTA on subsidies to these social programs and other services—or whatever is left of them after C-69 and Tory budgets, like the one this week, take their toll—will force Canada and the provinces to scale them down to inferior American levels. In foreign policy, the crisis in the Persian Gulf has shown the world that Canada no longer has a shred of foreign policy independent of the nation to which it has sold itself.

Finally, as an example closer to home of how so-called free trade leaves us anything but free to shape our own destiny, Premier Rae's promised provincial automobile insurance plan could—I emphasize "could"—set the province on a collision course with the FTA. This conflict could be very interesting indeed. Go for it, Premier Bob.

For Quebec separatists, all this weakening of Confederation is obviously good news. It certainly strengthens their argument that Confederation cannot work and that Canada is not really a country at all. Furthermore, the FTA enabled the separatists to counter the argument that defeated them in the Quebec referendum back in 1980, that Quebec could not make it alone economically. René Lévesque never missed any opportunity to argue that under the FTA everyone in North America will be part of the same economic unit, and Jacques Parizeau makes the same argument today as a way to defeat the economic argument against separatism.

No one knows at this time what the future holds for Confederation. Will there be a restructured federal system or will a diminished Canada have sovereignty-association, whatever that is, with Quebec and perhaps with new sovereign nations of native peoples? Or will we soon be dealing with a new nation across the Ottawa River with whom we must form new economic and political arrangements?

The negotiations undoubtedly will be extremely difficult, but Quebecers, native peoples and most other Canadians share similar democratic and humane values, and the final arrangement will, in the end, reflect them. What everyone seems to forget is that Canadians, Quebecers, non-Quebeckers and native peoples have so much more in common than whatever it might be that divides them.

These future arrangements, however, will surely be more fragile than is the case now. As such, we will, all of us, be even less able than we are now to resist the north-south pull of the United States. It is therefore all the more imperative, if we are to survive as a nation at all, that we must first throw out the present federal government and immediately abrogate the FTA.

We must also act to restore our hard-won unifying institutions that the federal government is systematically destroying. We must also ease trade restrictions between the provinces and set up serious national programs for the environment and research and development. Otherwise, Quebec will have every reason to leave a nation which, instead of developing coherent national policies, muddles along and lets multinationals and foreigners dictate economic policy. It is time we threw off our colonial past and started acting like an independent country.

Canada and Quebec can survive a stretched-out Confederation or even some form of Quebec sovereignty, but neither Canada nor Quebec can survive the FTA in an economic and political philosophy like that of the present federal government.

Lined up against any new revision of Confederation and the direction of genuine sovereignty will likely be the same unwitting but no less unholy alliance of big business and Quebec separatists that would like nothing better than to see a drastically weakened federal government. A great danger now is that a desperate Conservative government just might yield up virtually all its powers, as the Allaire report recommends. After all, such a move would be simply continuing its general decentralizing policies, whose centrepiece is the FTA. Such a surrender would satisfy big business, which always opposes government interference, except of course for bailouts, tax write-offs and the like.

It would also please Quebec nationalists and power-hungry provincial governments, as well as perhaps maintain the federal government's electoral power base in Quebec, if it stays in some form of Confederation. But it could well mark, for all practical purposes, the end of our nation and its culture. Such a hollow shell of a country could end up, if we are lucky, as a sort of Switzerland, which is run the way the Allaire report suggests for Canada, or a Czechoslovakia, with its two virtually autonomous parts. Because we are alone with the Americans here on this continent, though, we will more likely emerge as what Quebec separatists say we already are, a kind of North American Scotland, a pale or perhaps at times even amusing regional nuance of the United States, with only a few superficial trappings of nationhood, and maybe not even those.

While opposing such a fate, we in Ontario should be reminding our friends in Quebec to come to their senses and realize that a Canada weakened by the free trade agreement and other Tory policies, and by the resulting sovereignty or outright separation of Quebec, will also mark the end of Quebec and its distinctive culture too. For a supposedly sovereign Quebec will be in the same economic and political boat as Canada under the FTA. Once the fleur-de-lis waving and the singing of Mon pays in the streets ends, Quebec will wake up to find itself a tiny French ship in an immense North American sea. Its smaller economy will be even more vulnerable to foreign domination than Canada's. With luck, and thanks to its distinctive language and culture, Quebec could become for a while a kind of North American Ireland. More likely, under the FTA a supposedly sovereign Quebec will eventually dwindle into a North American Wales to Canada's Scotland.

Only when we realize what the future holds for us on this continent, with only the most powerful and energetic nation on earth for company, can we begin to work towards a revitalized Confederation. Again, members of the select committee, the Council of Canadians thanks you.

Mr Bisson: You were saying that you have been watching the committee hearings. One of the things I think the committee has been hearing a lot of is that people are mad. The overwhelming message is that people are somewhat disillusioned with the system of government, how government has been in some cases irresponsible or not listening to what people want. I think you struck something, and I just want you to expand on it a little.

If I understand what you are saying, and correct me if I am wrong, it is that that part of the problem today vis-à-vis the problems we are having in trying to get the dialogue going between Quebec and the rest of Canada on reconciling the differences and accommodating whatever needs in the Constitution is that people are not looking at the issue straight or more clearly because they are so upset about the rest and have lost confidence in the federal government because of the dismantling of the Foreign Investment Review Agency, the free trade agreement, deregulation, privatization and all of those other things.

I just want you to expand on that a bit, because I think that is part of the problem. Not only are people fearful of what the situation would be if Quebec were to leave, but at the same time they are mad over where we have been going with federal policy and the losing of our rights as individuals.

1700

Mr Adolph: There is nothing wrong with Canada. Canada is a wonderful country. The problem is the federal government. The country is fine; the government is terrible at what it is doing. They are systematically taking the country apart—it is as simple as that. We have to kick them out and get rid of them and reverse their policies. They will say I am an old reactionary and fuddy-duddy. Hah! They have torn the country apart, and we have to bring it back together.

Mr Bisson: But what do we do now?

The Chair: Mr Bisson, I am going to have to move on. There are a number of other questions.

Mr Bisson: Just very, very quickly.

The Chair: Very briefly, please.

Mr Bisson: What do we do now? The reality is that we do live in a democracy and they do have another two years in their term. We are going to be going through this process where we need to sit down as a country and start talking about what we do with our Constitution. What do we do in the meantime?

Mr Adolph: We have committee hearings like this and we think very hard about getting rid of our government. In a democratic system, if we can get them out before their term ends—when does it end, 1992 or 1993? If we can just get these guys out of office. They are destroying this wonderful country and we have no other way of doing it. They are not bugging. I do not know how to do that. I am not in politics. We may have to wait until the next election

Where are they now, 12%, 15%? They went up a little, 5%, 16%?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You are very correct in your assessment that this subject has not been brought forward to us. Maybe you saw last night that the students from Peterborough talked a little about the American—and I was rather impressed that they brought it. Do you think there is any hope? We have discussed from time and time and many people have brought to us the interprovincial trade barriers. But with the history of each province and the way this country was built, do you feel there is any hope that the interprovincial trade barriers can come down, and I guess my bottom line question, if the FTA can be reversed?

Mr Adolph: Can the FTA be reversed? There is a pause in it. It can be reversed in six months.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: But I am asking if you feel there is a political will—do you see that across the country at all—for interprovincial trade barriers being removed, or the FTA—

Mr Adolph: Everyone says it is a sort of—I cannot say motherhood issue any more—a parenthood issue that they should be reversed. Everyone says this but nothing seems to happen. But to hold the country together is the obvious thing to do. Other things: a real environmental policy—the Tory one is not a real environmental policy—a better communications network between the provinces. There are so many things we could do. I do not know if there is political will. I think committees like this are doing very well to make people realize we have a huge crisis on our hands. Maybe that will get people to act before it is too late.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for your presentation. It would like to hear your response to the Allaire report. In it, it still wants to maintain an economic association with the rest of Canada. I am curious what you think. Do you think we should make some kind of compromise in terms of economics?

Mr Adolph: A compromise of what?

Mr Malkowski: Following the Allaire report recommendations, they want some kind of economic association.

Mr Adolph: Well, the Allaire report, as I understand it, is essentially that the federal government would be reduced to have very few powers left. I assume all the tax moneys and everything would go to local governments and they would have the power; an extremely decentralized country. A country that works this way and rather successfully is Switzerland. The Swiss federal government deals with foreign policy, and practically that is it, maybe a few other things. It works in Switzerland. I do not think it would work in the United States, I do not think it would work in Canada, because instead of being on the crowded European scene with a lot of other countries, we are here with what Mr Trudeau used to call the elephant. It would be just us and them. So I do not see the country lasting except as a kind of nuance of the United States with some shadowy sovereignty. I do not see the Allaire report working much more than that. We are going to have to set up some kind of economic arrangements with Quebec somehow or other, no matter how we end up, but I do not see how—I mean, what is a country? If a country has no control over

its own economy, no control over its own foreign policy, no control over its own culture, do we have a country at all? Do we have, as I put it, a kind of regional shading, nuance, of the United States?

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Adolph.

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF ITALIAN CANADIANS

The Chair: I call next the National Congress of Italian Canadians.

Dr Castrilli: I am Annamarie Castrilli, the immediate past president of the National Congress of Italian Canadians. With me today are Mario D'Ambrosio, who is the president of the Ontario region, and Gregory Grande, who is the president of the Toronto district.

We are pleased to be here today to participate in what we think is a very important dialogue at a critical juncture in our history. With an economy facing one of the most serious recessions in recent memory, with Canada involved in a major offensive in the Persian Gulf, with crises looming in education, in health care, in housing, in unemployment, it may not seem the most appropriate time to sit and ponder constitutional issues. Yet now, as never before, we need to focus our attention and our goodwill to the resolution of the often acrimonious debate this country has endured from its inception and which today threatens to tear the nation apart.

It is our view that Canada can and will endure. Much, however, will be expected of us as Canadians. While never forgetting this country's history, we must take an honest look at Canada for what it is. We must stop blaming one another for what are the perceived failures of the past. We must articulate the present reality in clear and unambiguous terms. We will have to determine what is most important to us and be prepared to compromise. We will need tolerance and clarity of thought. Above all, we must have a process for redefining ourselves which will be accessible and above reproach.

All of this, in our view, is achievable. Canadians are prepared to listen to each other's needs to be reflected in the Constitution and to look at options that will best amalgamate those perceptions in a renewed and more vigorous federation. They want solutions and have little patience for doomsayers and empty rhetoric.

It is also our view that we must begin to seek consensus on broad principles that define us as Canadians, and only after that has been achieved should we focus on specific items, policies and programs to make those principles a reality.

Our views set out in the brief before you are those of an organization which has for some time used its energies and resources in pondering our nation's constitutional history. Our views are grounded in the belief that, while nation-building is arduous and lengthy, accommodation is possible.

The congress is the umbrella organization representing the interest of over one million Canadians of Italian origin living across Canada. The Ontario region is one of seven regions of the congress, and its largest, representing over 600,000 Ontarians. The Toronto district is the single largest district within the congress, speaking for approximately 400,000 Canadians of Italian background.

Our vision of Canada is predicated on eight principles which we feel must be considered in any constitutional renewal.

First, we must focus on the diversity of Canada. This country is no longer home to just two groups, but to people of many different cultural origins who consider themselves Canadians while at the same time wishing to retain their unique heritages. The duality principles espoused in the British North America Act are no longer applicable.

Second, the principle of equality must form the basis of the new Canada. Canadians do not feel that this is now the case. Even the supreme law of the land, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, imposes restrictions by guaranteeing rights and freedoms are limited by "such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society. To enshrine such a notion in the Constitution, we submit, is to render equality meaningless. The advantage of proving what is demonstrably justified will always be to the state. We have seen evidence of this just recently. We therefore urge the elimination in the future of any language approximating the limitations described herein.

1710

Third, we strongly favour the principle and practice of bilingualism, which we regard as more than an issue of language. It is central to the recognition of both our past and who we are today. French and English have been the mechanisms for communication for almost 130 years and have given us the framework for our laws. The legitimate aspirations of Quebecers to maintain their own language should be recognized not only in that province but throughout Canada. We urge Ontario to commit fully to the principle of two official languages and thus to usher in a new age of bilingualism and understanding.

Fourth, multiculturalism has been practised in Canada since 1971 when the government of the day declared that thenceforth in Canada there would be two official languages but no official cultures. Multiculturalism was seen as a vehicle for national unity, fostering a sense of confidence in one's identity and respect for that of others. Section 27 of the charter guaranteed equality regardless of race, national or ethnic origin and required the charter to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation of the multicultural heritage of Canadians. The Canadian Multiculturalism Act followed in 1987 and a bill creating a department of multiculturalism is expected to be given royal assent shortly.

Multiculturalism is now a fact of life in every part of the country, even Quebec, and is compatible with bilingualism. One of our greatest assets is that we are de facto a bilingual and multicultural country. There is no justification for thinking that multiculturalism is intended for Canadians of other than French or British stock or, worse still, for immigrants.

Multiculturalism is about the way in which we live with one another, about our obligations towards one another. It is at the heart of any discussion of equality and any strategy for the recovery of Canada. It must be understood as a tool for harmony that can bring Canadians together in respect and tolerance of one another's differences. But to achieve this, it must be given a proper definition that will

speak to all of Canada's cultures and will say clearly that they are all equal before and under the law and have the right to equal treatment.

Fifth, in keeping with the central importance we attach to equality and multiculturalism, we are of the view that the rights and needs of the native peoples of Canada must be respected. Land claims must be settled and the aspirations of Canada's original inhabitants must be fulfilled. This must no longer be ignored in constitutional talks.

Sixth is the principle that institutional changes are critical if Canada is to be renewed. Ontario is a case in point. Not one government department, not one judicial district, not one commission, not one council comes even close to reflecting the multicultural composition of this province. Power is concentrated in the hands of a few. We must ensure equal access to these institutions in order to ensure that they will reflect the equality principles which a multicultural Canada must espouse if it is to survive.

We will also have to look at the type of institutions we have. There may be a need for Senate reform and to review the role of the monarchy, for instance. Nor should we require that all provinces have the same institutions. The needs of each province must be taken into account and appropriate structures fashioned in response.

Seventh is the notion of the division of powers, surely the most difficult area of constitutional renewal. Our preference is for a federal system in which national standards will prevail. The division of powers envisioned in the BNA reflected only two provinces and two linguistic, cultural and religious groups. That division has spawned a good deal of debate since 1867 and even more litigation. It is outdated and must be re-examined in the light of current realities. It is not beyond the ability of Canadians to devise a form of federalism which will support both the provinces' desire for increased autonomy and the role of the central government in setting national policies and representing all of Canada at the international level.

Eighth is the importance of economic considerations. Canada will not survive without the resurgence of our economy. To achieve this, we advocate a greater emphasis on education and research and development, on continuing the equalization that now occurs between provinces, or ensuring the productivity of our citizens by providing first quality care to all.

Multiculturalism, too, is good business. With the growth of international markets, Canada now has an advantage unlike any other country. Canadians speak virtually every language in the world. We should encourage the retention of languages and the pride in one's heritage. We cannot afford to waste the opportunity which multiculturalism offers.

If we are to flourish as one nation, we must also abolish interprovincial trade barriers and we must cease these internal squabbles which will surely sap our energies and take away the focus we need for the economic battle ahead that we must win if we are to emerge as a successful nation in the 21st century.

These, then, are the eight principles we feel should guide our deliberations in the renewal of Canada. We will need tolerance, flexibility and patience if we are to reach

new agreement and live in relative harmony with one another. We must go back to first principles and find the common ground between us. We must build on the values we all share, being mindful of the past but never shackled by it. If we do, Canada will emerge as a just and renewed nation, an economic, political and social leader. We look forward to your questions and to working with this government on this important issue.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. It clearly elucidated certain principles which I must share with you. As we have travelled this province, there are principles generally shared by many people across this province, and our presentation well highlights some of those very important principles which we as a committee are going to have to deal with.

The principles you have brought forward seem largely founded on constitutional change, constitutional amendment or recognition, whatever. That is on one side. On the other, we have potentially, even at this moment, Ottawa and Quebec talking about a redistribution of powers provincially and federally, and that discussion might not necessarily require constitutional change. You have brought forward these principles which do require constitutional change. What is your reaction in the event that there is a bilateral agreement entered into with Quebec, basically settling the matter, leaving constitutional change and the principles which you have brought forward out of the picture? I would like to get your reaction to that. Certainly I believe it is important when we take a look at what the role of this province is in these discussions.

Dr Castrilli: It depends on the type of bilateral agreement the parties enter into. If it is an agreement that does not substantively affect the kinds of principles we are espousing, it is no more than another contract the federal government chooses to enter into with any party. If, however, the agreement entered into affects a significant portion of the population, even within Quebec—I will remind you that a large portion of our community resides in Quebec—and the minority rights of those individuals are threatened, or the equality opportunity of those individuals is affected, then we would feel very strongly about it. I would hope that the Ontario government at that point would look to that agreement and argue vigorously that it is an agreement which threatens national unity.

Mr Bisson: You raised a point in your brief that is rather interesting, and I went back and read it over a couple of times just to make sure I understood what you are saying. In the section of your brief where you talk about equality, you are saying that we should remove from the Canadian Charter of Rights the clause that says "such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society." My understanding of that part of the clause is basically that a group which goes out and purports it wants to do something contrary to what a democracy is all about—as an example, the group says, "We think it's our democratic right to be able to go out and hang whomever." That is what that clause is all about, to make sure that the Charter of Rights is not utilized to espouse something that is totally contrary to civilization as

we know it. Can you explain that, why you are saying that should be removed?

1720

Dr Castrilli: First of all, I think you are looking at the condensed version which I read. The brief you have before you in fact poses the legal argument, and I am sure your committee at its leisure will go through the legal provisions of our brief. Your interpretation of section 1 of the charter is certainly one that has been advanced before. But section 1, as you know, has also been used to quash the minority rights of individuals within a particular province, and I do not want to get into the specifics of the political decision.

I guess we would feel more comfortable with clearer statements about equality rather than limiting the equality provisions and leaving it in an arbitrary fashion, as it currently can be done, with respect to section 1. If we look to the example we have south of the border, where there is no such clause in place, the courts have nevertheless imposed certain restrictions so that the majority is protected. But it is only in very extreme circumstances; it is not at the political whim of the government in power at the time.

The difficulty with section 1 is that it binds too closely the protections that should be available under equality. I guess what I am arguing for is a different system of ensuring equality and—I think what you are saying—ensuring community standards. I think there are better ways of enforcing those community standards than through a clause of that nature, which truly restricts any meaningful interpretation of equality.

Mr Beer: As we have been going around the province I think it is fair to say that there is still a great deal of misunderstanding in some cases and just straight opposition in others to the dual aspect of being in favour of bilingualism and multiculturalism. Earlier this morning, in some of the presentations we were talking about the word "multiculturalism" and how it has taken on all kinds of different meanings depending on who is using it and so on and so forth.

In terms of this committee, what do you feel are the key things we need to explain about what it is, the openness of that term? What it is not meant to do is divide people or set up hyphenated Canadians and the like, which is a very strong view in different places. Do we need another word, another way to express this? Is this something your own organization has some difficulty with as well, in terms of perhaps how different generations look at it and see how it expresses their views of the country?

Dr Castrilli: First, let me say that if there is a misunderstanding of what multiculturalism is, what it is in law and what it is in practice, it is squarely the fault of governments, beginning from the very first government that enacted that policy, because there has never been any attempt to define what is meant. I think they have thrived from the confusion, quite frankly.

If you start with the statement that there are no official cultures in Canada, that surely must mean that all cultures are equal, yet people persist in thinking of this as an immigration policy, and we take great offence at that. I do not

know how you say to a group such as ours, some of whose members have been here for 150 years, "You're still an immigrant because your last name ends with a vowel, and therefore you're multicultural while everybody else is either francophone or anglophone." Surely that does not make any sense.

It is a very long answer and I know we do not have the time, but in the material we have brought to you is included a brief which describes the history of multiculturalism. It talks about some of the legal principles we think ought to be embodied and was presented to the Senate committee on Bill C-93 just recently, which was the department of multiculturalism and citizenship, which, by the way, we objected to. The creation of a department of multiculturalism which would segregate 40% of the population is unconscionable. So we have tried to assist the committee in that regard and provide a framework for a proper definition. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr Beer actually touched on the point I wanted to ask, so we will leave it at that. I want to thank you once again for your presentation, both for the short version and the longer, more extensive collation of materials. Thanks again.

Dr Castrilli: Thank you, and we wish you much success.

CANADIAN NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DEAF-BLIND

The Chair: I call next the representatives of the society of the deaf-blind.

Mr Wadman: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I have given you two papers. One I am presenting here in person and the other I have presented before. Use it as background information. I have entitled this paper Canada at the Crossroads and Deaf-Blind Persons. I am pleased to present on behalf of the Canadian National Society of the Deaf-Blind. To prepare you for the contents of my presentation, I wish to begin by introducing my group, the deaf-blind, through our accepted definition:

"A deaf-blind person is an individual with a substantial degree of loss of both sight and hearing, the combination of which results in significant difficulties in accessing information and in pursuing educational, vocational, avocational, recreational and social goals. Deaf-blindness is a unique disability requiring specialized services including adapted communication methods."

We depend on intervention services, defined as follows: "Intervention is the provision of a professional service, paid or voluntary, to facilitate the interaction of a deaf-blind person with his environment.

"As a process of facilitating, the intervention can include translation, interpreting, transliteration, guiding and habilitation and rehabilitation teaching in the individuals' preferred adapted receptive communication methods."

With those remarks in mind, please note how I approach this presentation following the suggested guidelines of discussion.

1730

1. "What are the values we share as Canadians?" As deaf-blind persons, we supposedly share the same values

and human rights as everybody else. The key difference is that, being deaf-blind, most of us do not even know we have these values or rights because of the lack of information accessibility.

To sum this up, emphasis needs to be placed on the fact that deaf-blindness is not deafness plus blindness; rather, it is a singular and unique disability. The combination of hearing and vision loss compounds the information accessibility simply by making all auditory and visual information distorted, and we generally do not know of opportunities we can take advantage of.

Quoting on advocacy, one teacher who is also deaf-blind says advocacy is essential for deaf-blindness as it is not well understood by the community and, in many cases is unheard of. This teacher repeats: Traditionally, advocacy has been done by hearing-sighted professionals who worked with deaf-blind people. Self-advocacy by deaf-blind individuals has been virtually unheard of.

2. "How can we secure our future in the international economy?" I will respond here by saying that we, the deaf-blind, can participate in this future only if information and appropriate services, namely, intervention services, are provided spontaneously and generously so that we can make decisions with the certainty of being in line with the mainstream of society—and at a local level, at that, for if we do not have anything locally, how can we expect to have anything internationally?

3. "What roles should the federal and provincial governments play?" As most of our social standards are mandated downward from the government, both levels should establish departments of responsibility that provide guidelines and codes of ethics for the private sector to follow. As it is now, both government levels are providing confusion and inconsistency for deaf-blind persons in that funds available are being disproportionately and discriminately given to people who are not deaf-blind according to the consumers perspective. In addition, both government levels are inconsistent in saying they want to hear from and help consumers but in fact listen to service providers and ignore the consumers.

4. "How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?" I know this issue faces the country as a whole. Our community has between 2,500 and 3,000 persons classifiable as deaf-blind. We could be considered a minority based on that label alone. Since deaf-blindness respects neither race, creed nor sex, such issues as this question poses are irrelevant. In fact, we could be called aboriginal people too. Stretching this into the area of integration, wish to comment as follows.

Governments have a strong policy of integration. This is highly commendable, yet it is counterproductive where deaf-blind people are concerned. Are you surprised? Consider placing a deaf-blind person in a nursing home where nobody can communicate with him or her. That integration is just as effective as solitary imprisonment. On the other hand, when the housing project for deaf-blind persons is opened this winter in North York, the so-called segregator turns into integration, as the deaf-blind members of the community, feeling human, move out into the larger community. Respect that concept, please.

5. "What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada?" This could be tied into the last question and comment. Add a list of languages, including American sign language, so as to make them officially recognized and therefore officially accessible for all. Singling out two major languages discriminates against all others. American sign language, adapted for deaf-blind persons, is used by 65% of our group.

6. "What is Quebec's future in Canada?" I do not know enough of the French history to participate fully in any discussion here, except to comment that Quebec treats its deaf-blind people in a different way from the rest of the country. The French government and other service agencies and associations label them "blind with a hearing impairment," thereby denying the French deaf-blind the recognition of their disability as a singular and unique disability, not part of any other. This so-called integration makes it difficult to find and help those who really need assistance as a direct result of deaf-blindness.

7. "What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region?" In terms of provision of services to deaf-blind citizens, regions outside of Ontario are far behind. Ontario is even able to claim it is a world leader in provision of services to deaf-blind individuals. Unfortunately, there is no money and no resources available for the rest of Canada to duplicate this model.

8. "What does Ontario want?" To increase from a pseudo-luxury status to rightful opportunity access to employment, educational, recreational facilities, information and services beyond what is provided, at the rate of four to six hours of services per individual per week. Compare this with the fact that you have your eyes and ears 24 hours per day. Think, then, of our using eyes and ears only four to six hours a week through the provision of intervenors. Also, the fact that 54% of Ontario's directly served deaf-blind eligible employable are employed does not make a dent in the fact that more could be working and going to school.

1740

To conclude, I want to emphasize the following: Relationships with other organizations tend to be strained primarily as a result of communication barriers. Deaf people shy away from touching; blind folks do not realize that touching for communication is even necessary. There are attempts at integration; barriers continue to exist. Most of the barriers are insistently attitudinal as there are so many methods of communication available.

Electronic networks are great; I am personally linked through the electronic network. Maybe four deaf-blind Canadians have access to computer equipment in Canada. England and Scandinavia are light-years ahead of us in this regard. The United States too has made deaf-blind consumers welcome on the open electronic systems. Socioculturally, this is not surprising. Other groups of disabled and minorities tend to do the same, that is, exclude others—except electronically. The exception here might be Disability Information Services of Canada, a truly cross-disability electronic network with known and unknown disabilities. Again and again, deaf-blind people lose out with the inaccessibility to computers and training for the same.

It is necessary to recognize and respect us as we try to help ourselves define deaf-blindness, define intervention, access information, try to make ourselves useful and teach others how normal we really are. I hope this paper positively demonstrates how factors may be altered in order to create an appropriate climate in which we may pursue an acceptable course of progressive action.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Wadman. Thank you for reminding us very clearly and forcefully of some basic needs and principles that I think we need to keep in mind.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you, Mr Wadman, for your presentation. It was very comprehensive, and it made an impact on us. A state school for the deaf and blind program in the United States exists, but in Canada a school for the deaf-blind is not in a school for the deaf. My question to you is: What are your feelings on whether a program or school for the deaf-blind should be separate, or should it be part of a provincial school for the deaf?

My second question is, my understanding is that there is no training for intervenors in existence anywhere in Canada. You want us to have that entrenched in the Constitution or somewhere, that we can provide intervention training or training for intervenors in Canada.

Mr Wadman: They all have 20 hours first, in the beginning. The school for the deaf in Halifax, Nova Scotia had a deaf-blind program, had the door closed. People like myself, they escaped to the United States or the United Kingdom, and that was good because the standards for Canadian education really stink, and still stink.

But today there is the Atlantic provinces centre for hearing impaired program for deaf-blind persons, and the William Ross MacDonald School for the blind has a deaf-blind unit too. Then there is a unit in the R. J. Williams School for the Deaf in Saskatoon. But the trouble is that there has been fighting and inconsistency as to whether deaf-blind people should be served by the deaf or by the blind or by the hearing-sighted community. It has been controversial over the years, because in the United States they were split. Some are absorbed into the schools for the blind and others are absorbed into schools for the deaf. But basically deaf-blind people communicate as deaf and travel and live as blind. So you can argue for all you are worth which side of the fence you are on, but there is no program anywhere in Canada, or in the United States for that matter, that takes care of deaf-blind groups once they are out of school. In other words, if somebody becomes deaf-blind at a later age, which is often the case, he does not have the opportunity to go to night school or to university to receive further education, and adjustment to deaf-blindness courses everywhere are sketchy, not consistent. However, they are fortunate that Ontario again took the leadership, global, on provision of intervenors.

Then late last night, I found out that George Brown College has agreed to proceed with an intervenor training program. So that means, depending on the enrolment, 25 new intervenors can come out each year after the first two years. We need them so desperately. Since George Brown College is taking this lead and Sheridan College is also

providing some high-quality communicator skills that we can use, I do not think the need to put this into legislation is viable.

Mr Eves: I would like to congratulate you on being an extremely effective self-advocate for the deaf-blind community. I think you have made every person, not only on this committee but across the province of Ontario this afternoon, much more aware of the plight of individuals in the deaf-blind community. Thank you.

1750

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Wadman, on behalf of the committee.

COALITION OF VISIBLE MINORITY WOMEN
CONGRESS OF BLACK WOMEN OF CANADA

The Chair: I will call next the immigrant and visible minority women's group. I point out to the committee members that we have, following this presentation, two more presentations before we can recess. Go ahead, madam, whenever you are ready.

Ms Benjamin: My name is Akua Benjamin and I am here representing this afternoon the Congress of Black Women of Canada, the Toronto chapter, as well as the Coalition of Visible Minority Women. Lest it be misunderstood in terms of my lone presence, I wish to preface my remarks by perhaps stating some of the things that were said this morning by the group of women who were here earlier, the Ad Hoc Committee of Women and the Constitution, and that is that the timing in terms of receiving the terms of reference for this committee's work came to us very late. What that means is that a number of women and women's groups representing black women as well as women of colour and immigrant women were not able to be here to respond. I fortunately happened to be one of the few members who, according to my schedule, could be here, but I am here representing many, many more women, and I want to tell you a little bit about that before I address or make my comments about the question that you are here for.

I want to thank you, first of all, for the opportunity to address the committee and to acknowledge that the consultative process for addressing these issues should at this point be made much more open and much more receptive to other groups, to other community organizations, because they too wish to be here today; they too wish to be part of this process.

The Coalition of Visible Minority Women is a provincial organization. We are composed of members who are new Canadians as well as second-, third-, fourth-generation Canadian-born women from 11 ethnocultural and racially distinct communities. As new immigrants, refugees and older Canadians, our experiences are quite similar because they are grounded in historic racist and sexist ideologies and practices endemic to Canadian society. Hence, the focus and task of our organization is to struggle for equal treatment and justice in all institutions and sectors of our society.

The coalition, as well as the Congress of Black Women, advocates on behalf of immigrant and visible minority women on issues of employment, skill streaming,

language training, child care, health. Those include issues of family violence, reproductive rights, policing issues, education and other issues that affect the lives of immigrants and visible minority women and their families.

Our strategies for addressing the issues include advocacy particularly with the provincial government, and along with some of the comments that were made earlier this morning, we too have been part of the consultative process in the past around constitutional reform, including the Meech Lake accord, the last Meech Lake discussions that were held here. We have undertaken and demonstrated pilot projects, we have been involved in public education and we work co-operatively with government agencies, private sector organizations and labour organizations. It is therefore in that context of struggling against racism and sexism in Canadian society that we frame our remarks on constitutional reform or on issues that affect Canadian unity.

There are three areas that we would really want to see the unity talks begin to address. One is the whole notion that Canada is not simply a bicultural, bilingual nation but a nation comprising, first and foremost, the indigenous aboriginal peoples of this land. Canada also comprises people who are distinct by race, by culture, by religion, by language and by a whole host of other backgrounds.

The second framing of constitutional unity, we think must include a recognition that racism and sexism are historically entrenched in our society, and while its impact is most experienced by certain minority groups, racism and sexism adversely impact on all sectors—and I wish to underscore that: on all sectors, all institutions, all groups and individuals in our society.

The third context for framing the discussion, we think should include a formula for Canadian unity which is not divisive but all-embracing and all-encompassing. Hence unity must take into account notions of power, concepts of dominance, influence and control, as well as it must take into consideration concepts of subordination, powerlessness and disadvantage from many sectors of our society.

During the period of the Meech Lake debate there was a heightened awareness of the difficulty of uniting English and French Canada under the "distinct society" clauses that were being proposed. It took for us Elijah Harper's stance to bring to the attention of all Canadians that a sovereign Canada is more than two nations or distinct societies.

Not only do we feel that the aboriginal people's homeland must be recognized but that many minority groups as well have contributed to the development of Canada. These include the black loyalists, who are now resident for the most part in the province of Nova Scotia; Chinese and Japanese railroad workers; Italian construction workers; black women and Filipino women who are domestic workers in this country, as well as a number of other racial and cultural groups that have contributed to the development of Canada. This history and contribution of these groups must be given the recognition that is due to them in all sectors and institutions of our society.

We feel that concomitant with this focus must be legal recognition of the right to self-determination of the aboriginal peoples, as well as the right to equal treatment and equality for all and for all people of colour, ethnocultural

well as racially distinct groups. We feel that with such a cognition, this will signal the commitment to equality and equal treatment for all Canadians, including those who are most disadvantaged.

Sexism, and particularly racism, are often treated as a new phenomenon in Canada. They are often regarded as new issues that arose with the most recent immigrants to this country. This myth allows governments, institutions and society in general to respond to both racism and sexism in a very topical and ancillary fashion. This means that the main, agencies and institutions respond mainly to critical racial incidents and focus mainly on victims of racism and sexism in a short-term, ad hoc fashion. This undoubtedly leads to a blame-the-victim syndrome and in the long run perpetuates racism and sexism in our society.

300

There must be recognition that our society is stratified by both race and sex, that it is not a recent phenomenon but historic, that it is endemic to all institutions and, while the evils may be exacerbated, when there is a greater influx of immigrants and refugees who are women and also distinct and of distinct racial backgrounds, racism and sexism play a role in the society by keeping groups divided for the purpose of maintaining the present social, economic and political status quo.

We believe that this understanding can lead to expanding our vision of methods for eliminating racism and sexism. Therefore any constitutional change, from the east to the west, from the north to the south, must go beyond what is presently enshrined in the Constitution of 1982 and that which has been promoted through the Meech Lake accord. It must go beyond individual acts, to a broader understanding of what these acts of racism and sexism mean to our society.

We believe that unity cannot be truly accomplished unless the imbalance of power, dominance, influence and control maintained by certain sectors and groups in society is shared with groups that are disfranchised, disadvantaged and outside equal access to goods and services of our province and of our country.

In particular, we again draw attention to aboriginal people, to immigrant and visible minority women, to domestic workers, to minority women, particularly in the garment and service industry, to racial minority youths and children, to single parents. These are groups that are among the poorest members of our society. Their needs are either paid little attention or, when addressed, they are presented in piecemeal fashion. These approaches help to perpetuate their condition.

We believe that addressing oppression and exploitation by rearranging power imbalances is a new formula for beginning to address unity, for beginning to eliminate subordination, beginning to eliminate powerlessness, oppression and exploitation for racial minority youths, particularly black students, who are marginalized by the streaming process within our school system. This practice means that the future generation of our youths and children will increasingly be left out of opportunities to advance to their highest levels and to make a valuable contribution to Canada. The ethnocentrism in our present educational system must be overturned in order that black and other youths can be

valued and value part of the educational institution as it meets their needs and their challenges.

We recognize that the human rights codes and multicultural policies of all governments have proved to be very limited and inadequate at addressing issues like streaming, like inequality. Immigrant and visible minority women are hardworking, talented contributors to our society. They must be given opportunity to share and exercise their skills and talents with all of society.

Demographers know that Canada must increasingly depend on immigrants if it is to continue to develop. It is not simply the needs of the population that must be addressed. The issues of racism and sexism are key if we are, as a country and as a province, to work together in harmony and in unity. Racism and sexism must be eradicated, and our Constitution must include this type of focus.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. I have one question. You speak about issues of great importance being recognized within the Constitution, and I am wondering if you might share with the committee whether you feel the issues can be best addressed at a provincial level or whether there is the necessity for these issues to be addressed at a federal level.

Of course, one is sort of into a balance as to whether the federal government should be dealing with a standard across the country, keeping in mind that it will be up to the individual provinces to meet that standard or not, but I want to know whether you feel that the particular issues you feel should be found within the Constitution should be found within the Constitution on the provincial side or the federal side.

Ms Benjamin: The point I am trying to make is that our issues of racism and sexism are not new issues and they are not simply provincial issues. These are Canadian issues, so I think it behooves the federal government to address these issues, to have them as part of our constitutional framework.

I think that in a province such as Ontario where you have a high representation of minorities—I believe the highest in the country is here—program and policy development pieces have to be in place, but the province takes its mandate or its direction from a Constitution that enshrines the rights of all. To the extent that I think that racism and sexism are not—excuse me, I am sorry, but I overheard a remark a minute ago as I was delivering my speech and I think it is very rude. I would ask if the gentlemen speaking can please be quiet while I speak. Thank you.

The point I am trying to make is that racism and sexism are not issues that just affect a minority. These are Canadian issues, so I think it behooves the federal government and the processes that we have to address that issue via the Constitution, and I think that any province will take its direction, its leadership, from a central government.

The Chair: Thank you.

ONTARIO FEDERATION OF STUDENTS
FÉDÉRATION DES ÉTUDIANTS
ET DES ÉTUDIANTES DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: I call next the representatives from the Ontario Federation of Students. Go ahead.

Mr Jackson: Thank you very much for the opportunity to present to you today. My name is Tim Jackson. I am the chairperson of the federation. Greg Elmer is the communications director for the federation. We would also like to thank Mr Silipo, who spoke at our general meeting about a month ago to student leaders across the province.

La Fédération des étudiants et étudiantes de l'Ontario représente environ 240 000 étudiants dans les collèges et les universités de la province. Elle a été fondée en 1972, alors ça fait à peu près 20 ans qu'on fait des choses pour les étudiants dans la province.

Post-secondary education is one of those areas that is very definitely both a provincial and a federal responsibility. What we would like to do today is explain to you why we feel the current funding arrangement is not working and leave you with four recommendations that we hope the committee, when discussing Ontario's role within Confederation and its relationship to the federal government, will consider.

While we are going to discuss primarily funding of post-secondary education, we did want to draw to the committee's attention some of our policies in terms of French-language support in the province. We have for several years supported both autonomous, unilingual francophone colleges and universities within the province, and we hope that this committee will play some sort of active role in ensuring the funding from the Secretary of State is guaranteed or, if the Secretary of State balks at funding for these institutions, that the provincial government will go ahead and continue to establish the French colleges it has already committed to and hopefully establish at least one francophone university within the province.

1810

I would like to start at about 1967, which is the first time that the federal government made transfers to the provinces as opposed to directly to universities and colleges. At that time, the federal government, to all intents and purposes, provided 50% of operating expenditures. The province was required to spend money on colleges and universities and would receive a matching grant from the federal government. The incentive obviously was that for every dollar spent, it got another dollar from the feds. If the province did not spend on post-secondary education, it did not receive the transfer payment from the federal government.

In 1977-78, the established programs financing act was introduced. At that time, the federal government agreed to make transfers to the provinces for health care and education, but now the provinces were no longer required to spend that money on post-secondary education. The money can be spent on anything. One of the long-standing jokes has been that many a Minister of Colleges and Universities has said that every road leads to a university, when explaining why money that should have been targeted for post-secondary education was spent on roads and transportation.

Ontario currently ranks ninth out of 10 provinces in funding for a student. We think part of the problem is the way the funding formula currently works. The federal government transfers both money and cash but also tax points

to the provinces. The provinces and the federal government have never been able to agree on what exactly the tax points represent and how much money they represent.

The current Minister of Colleges and Universities acknowledges that at least 73% of all money spent on post-secondary education in this province comes from the federal government. If you include the transfer of tax points, that amount goes up to about 93%, which suggests the provincial government is not really kicking in much at all. If we still had the matching grant system, Ontario would either be forced to spend more on post-secondary education or receive a much smaller grant from the federal government.

The current situation that Michael Wilson and Brian Mulroney have introduced since they took office has been to cut transfer payments to the provinces. On Tuesday they were again frozen through 1995. The transfer payments only grow if a province's population grows; not a student population, but a population. This is something that we hope the committee will address in future negotiations with the federal government, to ensure that growth in transfer payments, particularly for post-secondary education, is based on growth of student population, not growth of population as a whole.

The push to freeze transfer payments that Mr Wilson and Mr Mulroney have introduced and continue to implement simply leads to increased tuition costs within the province. The unfortunate thing is that, as these tuition costs go up, they certainly do not go towards quality of education, because there is less government money being kicked in. Students are paying more and more for less and less.

It is no surprise to us that whenever anyone talks about the current funding situation at colleges and universities they refer to a crisis and they refer to a crisis that started about 12 years ago. The Minister of Colleges and Universities' advisory group suggests that we should be returning to the funding standards we had in this province of about 13 years ago. That is exactly the same time when the funding arrangement changed, where the province were no longer required to spend money on post-secondary education to get money from the federal government at which point the complete accountability mechanism was lost.

Although the federal government has cut the transfer payments, we do not believe the province of Ontario can simply blame the federal government. It must, of course, acknowledge what is happening, and I think this is similar to health care. Students are always put in this situation. You come to the provincial government and are told, "The feds aren't giving us enough money." We go to the federal government and are told, "They're not spending all the money at the provinces on post-secondary education that they should." We hope this committee will do something to try to ensure that students are not played off from one government to another, that some accountability mechanism is put in place.

We would like to leave with you four recommendations.

The federal and provincial governments must undertake a study of the present established programs financing formula and consider alternatives to this formula. Obviously,

e would hope that that study would be consultative with faculty, with staff, with students, but the current system does not work. No one seems to like the current EPF funding formula and we hope you will take an active role in trying to come up with a new one.

We believe that this formula must include a mechanism for accountability of the provinces spending the money on post-secondary education, must represent and reflect student growth in the province and must guarantee some sort of cost-sharing between the two governments.

We believe there needs to be a federal post-secondary education financing act that would entrench national standards. By national standards, we mean making sure that student aid is the same in every province. Currently, there are 10 different student aid packages between the 10 provinces. We need national standards so that students can also be portable from one province to the other within the country.

Finally, we call for the establishment of a national council, made up of government representatives, both federal and provincial, post-secondary faculty, staff, students and administrators, to advise both levels of government. Obviously, the strongest of the recommendations is the first one, that we need to redesign the EPF funding formula, but we certainly hope you will consider all four in your report and in future dealings with the federal government.

Mr Malkowski: Your presentation was very clear. As we have been travelling around the province, we have been very much made aware of the needs of a college and university for the francophone community in the north. I would like to ask you two questions. First, how many francophone colleges and universities are there in Canada that you know of in existence? Second, which place do you think would be the best place to establish something like that in the province, and would that be a college or university?

Mr Jackson: The first question, in terms of how many there are, off the top of our heads we believe there are about 10. There are several outside of Quebec, several in the province of New Brunswick specifically. Currently, Ontario has one unilingual francophone college.

The Minister of Colleges and Universities has received a report recommending that two more be established, one in northern Ontario and one in southwestern Ontario. We fully support those recommendations. The one in the north, I understand, will probably happen. The government is baulking a bit on the one in the southwest. It has been suggested that probably somewhere around the St Catharines area would be the best place, somewhere in southwestern Ontario, because I think there is a need for a French college. We have also called for the establishment of a French university in northern Ontario specifically as a starting point, but would also support one in the south.

Mr Malkowski: I would just add briefly, from the information we have been receiving, you realize that there is only one university in the world for deaf people and that is in Washington, DC, Gallaudet University. That was established at the same time as Canada, so you can imagine that if you had no francophone university or college in Canada, when Canada was growing as a country, I think

that is a poor statement on us as a nation. But the point is that all cultures need to be valued in terms of institutions.

Mr Jackson: Yes, agreed. We have always pushed policy and pushed the government on issues for disabled students within the province of Ontario. There simply are inadequate resources. The University of Trent right now is a perfect example, where a student is taking the university through the courts, challenging it because of a lack of access for the student and we have backed the student 100%.

1820

ONTARIO SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' FEDERATION

FÉDÉRATION DES ENSEIGNANTES-ENSEIGNANTS DES ÉCOLES SECONDAIRES DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: I call then our final presenters in this session from the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, Raymond Connolly and Neil Walker.

Mr Walker: I am Neil Walker, an executive assistant in the external policy department at the OSSTF, and with me is Ray Connolly, also an executive assistant in the French-language services department.

I would point out that OSSTF is very pleased to have this opportunity to speak with you. Canadian unity is a matter of some concern to us. You have received a copy of a press release that went out following the Ontario Coalition for Social Justice's response to the federal budget, and I would draw your attention to our president's remarks: "What hope do we have of saving Confederation if major national symbols such as the CBC, Via and universal medicare are thrown on the garbage dump?"

We regret the small amount of time available to prepare submissions to this commission, but we would congratulate the government for this initiative which will lead, we believe, to maintaining Canadian unity at a time when all the provinces, as well as the Canadian government, are seeking the road to accommodation.

M. Connolly : La Fédération des enseignantes-enseignants des écoles secondaires de l'Ontario compte au-delà de 43 000 membres dont plus de 3500 enseignent en français, langue première, ou en français, langue seconde. Nous représentons également des psychologues, des travailleurs sociaux, des orthophonistes, des secrétaires et des professeurs suppléants qui oeuvrent dans les écoles de langue française.

En dedans de notre structure, nous avons un comité de langue française qui a été fondé en 1968 afin de permettre aux enseignants de langue française en Ontario d'obtenir des instruments pédagogiques qui favoriseraient un enseignement de qualité dans les écoles secondaires de langue française nouvellement créées. Par la suite, le comité s'est allié aux collègues anglophones de la FEESO dont la vision canadienne était semblable à la nôtre, c'est-à-dire une vision qui engendre la conception d'un pays uni sur un principe inviolable de multiples cultures à l'intérieur d'un Canada bilingue.

Mr Walker: OSSTF has contributed to the growth of its members who teach in French as a first language or in immersion French. The federation also has encouraged the

development of the teaching of the French tongue both in Canada and at the international level. We have tried to bring help to teachers of such francophone countries as Guinea, Senegal, the Ivory Coast and Zaïre.

It is our policy, which we adopted in 1986, that the province of Ontario should declare itself officially bilingual by stating its intention to adhere to sections 16 to 20 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We believe that the presence of Quebec in the heart of the Canadian Confederation creates a healthy and enriching linguistic and cultural experience.

M. Connolly : En outre, cela crée un climat de compréhension, de tolérance et d'ouverture d'esprit face aux citoyens qui proviennent de divers pays ainsi qu'aux nations qui nous entourent.

Bref, notre réputation mondiale de peuple compréhensif découle en partie de la capacité de nos citoyens à s'accommoder, à se respecter, à fraterniser, à être solidaires les uns les autres grâce aux différences culturelles et linguistiques qui existent au Canada.

Nous espérons que le Québec choisira de demeurer au sein d'un régime fédéral. Toutefois, le choix du Québec n'influencera en aucune façon les francophones de l'Ontario qui y habitent depuis des siècles et qui ont défriché plusieurs coins de terre ici en Ontario. Au risque de nous répéter, les francophones de l'Ontario n'ont aucune intention de démentager. Ni leur maison ni leur âme ne sont à vendre.

Je devrais peut-être ajouter aussi qu'il y a des fois une fausse impression que les francophones de l'Ontario sont des gens qui sont venus ici récemment, qui sont d'ici du Québec. Par contre, il y a beaucoup de francophones qui sont ici depuis, comme je l'ai dit, des siècles, qui sont un peuple fondateur ici en Ontario aussi bien que les gens qui étaient un peuple fondateur au Québec. C'est un point que je pense est important à mentionner.

Mr Walker: The francophone members of OSSTF and other associations have contributed to the growth of the French fact in Ontario. They will continue to do so because they believe that quality education goes beyond the boundaries of a province or of a country. In effect, learning goes beyond political conjecture. It addresses the humanity of the individual. The teaching of two official languages reflects and at the same time creates the distinct culture of our country. We believe that this bilingual character of our province should continue to exist even if Quebec decides to leave us.

OSSTF insists that the Silipo commission consider the needs of the students and the educators who tomorrow must come to grips with a world whose boundaries are still to be defined and whose cultures intermingle. We wish always to maintain that distinctiveness.

M. Connolly : La francophonie de l'Ontario s'inspire de l'appui inconditionnel que le NPD a offert à cette même francophonie lorsque ce parti était dans l'opposition. Nous souhaitons que cet engagement saura se maintenir, s'affirmer et même s'accélérer tout au long de son mandat.

La FEESO et le comité de langue française maintiennent le lien fédéraliste. Également, nous endossons l'aspiration

de la communauté francophone à vouloir vivre ici en Ontario à titre d'égaux tel que reconnu par la Charte.

Nous reconnaissons aussi formellement dans nos politiques le droit des parents d'avoir une éducation dans la langue officielle de leur choix pour leurs enfants et nous croyons aussi que les autorités scolaires devraient fournir le nécessaire pour que cette éducation ait lieu.

Selon notre pensée, la commission Silipo ferait bien recommander des écoles d'accueil subventionnées par fédéral et régies par le provincial là où il existe un haut taux d'immigrés. Ces écoles d'accueil pourraient permettre nos immigrés d'acquérir l'une ou l'autre des deux langues officielles du Canada de même qu'un aperçu général de notre culture canadienne.

La Fédération des enseignantes-enseignants des écoles secondaires de l'Ontario souhaite que votre enquête soit des plus fructueuses et conforme à notre vision d'un Canada uni s'ouvrant aux multiples cultures au sein d'un Canada respectueux de l'intégrité de ses peuples. Tel l'ont voulu les pères de cette grande Confédération.

Voilà le pays, voilà la conception, voilà le chemin à suivre pour cette commission.

Mr Walker: To conclude, we believe that our federation demonstrates the richness of our country. We represent many francophone employees who work in the public system and in a good number of the separate schools. We would like to see in Canada the spirit of solidarity and goodwill which are supreme among our members.

The Chair: Thank you very much for the presentation. Questions? Mr Wilson?

Mr G. Wilson: Thank you for your presentation. We have heard from—at least in my short time on it—a couple of delegations of high school students. I was wondering what your impression is of the flexibility of the system to respond to events like the constitutional crisis in Canada. Some of the students, for instance, did not seem to be too aware of conditions in Quebec or what, I guess, even the colleagues in other parts of the province thought about the situation. If they had that curiosity about what is happening, how easy is it to find materials on a short-term basis?

Mr Connolly: I think you are right. I think it is difficult to communicate to students. I do not think it is just a question of students; I think the whole of the Canadian people are suffering now from a difficulty of understanding people from various other parts of the country. I think it has been exacerbated by a lot of other conditions—the whole free trade question.

Now, certainly, at a time when Canada is in a great constitutional crisis, our television is inundated by the war in the Gulf, which again brings students to a point, I think, of a certain level of frustration and an inability to take in all of the negative things that are happening now and I think it is very unfortunate that we have not had the opportunity to really concentrate on this subject as well as we should have, given all of the turmoil that has existed around it.

I certainly believe that it is our duty as educators to do the best job we can to communicate to the students the very serious nature of the ongoing struggle that we have had

Mr G. Wilson: I wish you luck.

The Chair: That concludes this sitting for us. We will recess at this point for a short dinner break and come back, if we can, as close to 7 as we can, shortly after 7, to begin the evening session. We will need to ask the people in the

audience, along with us, to also vacate the room for the break because our staff will need to reset the room for the evening sitting, because we will be breaking the committee into two parts for that purpose.

The committee adjourned at 1831.

EVENING SITTING

The committee, in part, resumed at 1914 in room 151.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order and welcome you all this evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We want to welcome you to this evening's session here in Toronto.

This is the continuation of our hearings across the province, ending up today and tomorrow here in Toronto. Because of the number of people who were interested in talking to us, as you can see, for this evening we have had to divide the committee into two halves. I will be chairing this half and the Vice-Chair is chairing the other half of the committee in another room in the Legislature. These proceedings will be shown live over the parliamentary channel; the other proceedings will be taped and shown, I think, tomorrow afternoon. We have done that to accommodate as many people as we possibly could in speaking to us, to respond to the demand there has been for people to speak to us.

Also, as I think people know, but it is probably worth while to underline at the beginning, we have had to establish a five-minute deadline for people. We are going to have to be fairly strict with that, because we do have more than a full list of people, and in fact we have other people who are on a waiting list in case we are able to get through the list any faster. We will sit for the next three hours and get through as many people as we can and do the best we can, but we ask for and appreciate your co-operation in that as well.

MICHAEL DEAN

The Chair: Without further ado, let me call Michael Dean as the first speaker to come forward.

Mr Dean: Thank you, Mr Chairman, and good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael Dean, private citizen. I represent no special-interest group. I am just speaking on behalf of most of the people I know and myself.

I came to Canada 24 years ago. Since that time, I have seen almost constant friction between French and English Canada over language, government contracts or just power plays. You cannot have two masters. Double authority and peace do not go together; the two will always be in conflict. When the issue of ultimate authority is not clear and singular, there will always be unrest and instability. Duality divides, language divides, division weakens. We must unite at all costs. A house divided within itself will never prosper, and unless we get our house in order we will not be able to compete with the emerging giant economic threat in blocs like the European Community and the Pacific Rim. We must start preparing ourselves for the 21st century right now.

We support the position that Confederation should be maintained, but that it can only be maintained by a clear commitment to Canada as one nation, in which the demands and aspirations of all regions are entitled to equal status in constitutional negotiations and political debate

and in which freedom of expression is fully accepted as the basis for language policy across the country. Should these principles of Confederation be rejected, Quebec and the rest of Canada should consider whether there exists a better political arrangement which will enrich our friendship and respect our common requirements by mutual consent and for our mutual benefit.

Government: We support the principle of allowing constituents a recall procedure against an MP who they feel has violated his or her oath of office. We believe public policy in a democratic society should reflect the will of the majority of the citizens. We also believe in the common sense of the common people, their right to be consulted on public policy matters before major decisions are made.

We support the re-examination of MPs' and senators' expense allowances, free service, staff privileges, limousines, in light of private sector standards and in light of the failure of MPs to reform the House of Commons. Until a balanced budget is achieved, the salaries and expenses of government MPs and their officers should at least be frozen.

We support a general program of expenditure reduction until elimination of the deficit or the debt is achieved, characterized by cuts in spending on parliamentary institutions and party caucuses, thick layers of middle management in federal administration, foreign aid, grants to interest groups for the purpose of political lobbying, subsidies and tax concessions to business and federal pet projects such as official bilingualism and multiculturalism.

We oppose the current concept of multiculturalism as a hyphenated Canadianism pursued by the government of Canada and would end the funding of the multicultural program. We support the preservation of cultural background as a matter of personal choice: Whether or not an ethnic group preserves its cultural background is that group's choice. Most special-interest groups should be financed by the people they benefit and not by the taxpayer.

Immigration: Canada's immigration system is a mess. For more than a decade, it has wandered aimlessly from crisis to crisis with periodical promises of reform and amnesties to solve the problem of illegal residence. The views of ordinary Canadians have been largely ignored while immigration agents, lawyers and special-interest people have grown fat on our folly.

For every nation, there comes a time when these people must stand up and be counted, a time when the people and not the politicians must control the destiny of the nation. We have seen a spectacular example of this in Eastern Europe. We say we are a democracy, but a country is not a democracy simply because it gives the right to people to elect representatives. These representatives must do the will of the people. Probably the most important question we will ever ask ourselves is this: Who do we want to represent us in the next constitutional battle? Do we want the present inmates—

1920

The Chair: Mr Dean, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Dean: Do we want one of the other two parties, who also supported the Meech Lake accord unconditionally, one of which wants to take us back into the future and lead us down the path of socialism? No way. We have waited enough. We must build a new Canada. We must seek reform. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ROBERT MAULE

The Chair: Robert Maule, and I will be calling Dorothy Whitworth after Mr Maule.

Mr Maule: Thank you, Mr Chairman. You and the other committee members look remarkably fresh considering all the things that have been going on.

My name is Robert Maule. I am a graduate student at the University of Toronto. I grew up in Toronto, though I have worked summers on the Trans-Canada Highway in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. I spent 10 years living in Vancouver. I have done two summers of research in London, England. I studied one summer in Madison, Wisconsin, and I lived for over two years in Chiang Mai, Thailand, and most of my comments are going to be based upon my background.

My great-great-grandfather came to New Brunswick in 1805. He was a captain in the British army and had transferred to the New Brunswick fencible infantry. At that time, New Brunswick was one of the colonies that made up British North America. The political, social and economic unity between the colonies of British North America was light.

If the Allaire report is an indication of where politicians want to lead Canada, then it would seem that we are heading back in the direction of loosely connected political entities not unknown to my ancestor.

In any case, he left British North America in 1810 to pursue his military career in Great Britain. My great-grandfather came to Toronto in 1870 to serve as a deputy sheriff. He had been a captain in the British Imperial Army, he had fought in Crimea and in India during the mutiny. The British North America of his grandfather's day was confined to Newfoundland. By 1870, the former British colonies, with the exception of Newfoundland, had coalesced into a dominion under political leaders who decided that Canada should be a constitutional monarchy with a strong central government.

From 1867 until the present moment, that system of government has served its citizens well. Canada has one of the highest standards of living in the world. It is not subject to periodic coups by the military as experienced in Thailand nor are its citizens subject to the misguided and rapacious policies that many people in Burma endure under a military dictatorship.

Certainly, Canada is not perfect. We do have problems. For example, geographic and demographic patterns have led to so-called have and have-not areas. In addition, the Canadian veterans who suffered torture and deprivation in Japanese prisoner-of-war camps during the Second World War have not attained any government support in their quest for compensation from Japan, but by and large the evolution of Canada has been a great and glorious achievement.

In the rush forward to alter our institutions, many people have lost sight of our traditions and what they symbolize. Responsible government, equality under the law and freedom of the press are but some of the benefits. Yet the most dynamic and powerful social force in this century has been nationalism. This notion of nationalism may prompt Quebec to leave Canada, but what is to be done?

On the one hand, we cannot force Quebec to remain within a political structure that it wishes to leave. Ultimately, the final decision rests with the people of Quebec, but if Quebec does decide that no, it will not establish itself as a sovereign state, Canadians have reason to be pleased. However, to retain Quebec, politicians must guard against weakening the powers of the federal government in the way the failed Meech Lake accord would have done. All provinces must have the same powers and must be treated equally. If Quebec does decide to leave Canada, the rest of Canada, as nine provinces, can and will survive. The adjustment may be difficult, but Canada will make the adjustment.

Obviously, certain programs fed by the taxpayers, such as bilingualism, will not be viable any longer. The number of French-only speakers in a Canada without Quebec would be too small to warrant the cost in bureaucracy now involved in running this program.

What other changes might occur? Senate reform may be one area available for a manoeuvre. Our fellow member of the Commonwealth, Australia, can serve as an example of how an elected Senate functions in relation to responsible government. Needless to say, whether Quebec remains in Canada or not, our form of government, the constitutional monarchy based upon the British parliamentary tradition, must be protected. We understand the system and we have operated it efficiently.

One of the key problems I have found does not lie in the weakness of our parliamentary system but in the weakness of our educational system. We must be the only country in the world that does not teach its students who the head of state is. People who only take one history course and one geography course in high school can hardly be expected to understand the working of our political system, let alone be able to make an intelligent comparison of our system with those that are operative in other countries. See to it that the youth do not grow up little-minded. Have them remember Macaulay's fine words, "A people which take no pride in the noble achievements of remote ancestors will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants."

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

DOROTHY WHITWORTH

The Chair: Dorothy Whitworth, and following Ms Whitworth I will be calling Barbara Yurkoski.

Ms Whitworth: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee, Canadians are overgoverned yet poorly represented by their elected members. Residing in North York, I must support six layers of government, with virtually no input into the system despite my efforts. The Fathers of Confederation promised us peace, order and good government.

One wonders how they would view Canada today. Who do our politicians serve? All too often, personal gratification and power are paramount. With a huge national debt and a constitutional crisis brought on by their actions, it is akin to Nero's fiddling while Rome burned.

In 1967 we celebrated Canada's centennial. I remember a proud nation, including my family, singing, "Canada, now we are 20 million." Our national debt was \$28.5 billion. The 1991 population is 27 million, and that debt has soared to \$400 billion. Why? How on earth did we allow ourselves to get into such a mess that a third of every tax dollar goes to service the debt—not to pay it now, just to pay the interest? We must review the monetary policies and programs of that period and learn from those mistakes. Canada is fast becoming another Argentina, a Third World country. Who has the backbone and the guts to apply the brakes? It has to be the people, for we can no longer trust our politicians. They have failed us and failed Canada.

If a new Constitution or major amendments are required, a constituent assembly must be convened, with each and every clause ratified by Canadians through referendum. No package deals allowed. This will take time and patience, but the end result will beat rolling the dice.

My own recommendations: Maintain a strong central government; direct election of the Prime Minister and premiers; accountability of all elected and appointed officials, with a mechanism for recall and/or impeachment; a fixed four-year term federally and provincially; aboriginal land and treaty rights settled in full; Yukon and Northwest Territories achieve provincehood; remove trade barriers between provinces.

On the local scene, I would like to see the Metropolitan Toronto council be disbanded and co-ordinated services managed by a committee from the current municipalities. One exception should be a publicly elected chairman.

On the education scene, math, science, history, geography, English and French must be made national—underline "national"—mandatory subjects from kindergarten to graduation. Compulsory biannual testing of teachers is also necessary.

My local concerns are the crime rate that is escalating in Metro Toronto and police who recently admitted that they have lost control over certain sections of the city. We are becoming a carbon copy of New York despite the valiant efforts of our police force. Strong measures are necessary to regain our city from the criminal element.

I am still shocked by the high number of illiterate graduates after 10 years of passing through the public school system. Back to basics in reading is essential. Unproven methods are stealing our children's future.

I am also mad at this province that dictates mandatory programs in the North York school system and yet does not provide one penny for education in that city. What a nerve. It is a bloody nerve, actually.

1930

As we approach the 21st century, communications are of the utmost importance, and internationally the English language has become the accepted vehicle. It is the language of science, aviation, commerce, our biggest trading partner and the new united Europe. Canada cannot afford

two official languages. The cost is too great, not only dollars, but most importantly in its divisiveness. Canada politicians have become adept at institutionalizing divisiveness, and then wonder why there is a lack of unity. We must remove all artificial barriers. We need more common threads to bind us. Additional languages can survive and flourish in Canada if individuals have the determination to maintain them by their own efforts and cost. I have many neighbours who are living proof of that philosophy.

In 1989 the admitted cost of official bilingualism at the federal level was \$1.7 million per day, and I have that writing from Senator Lowell Murray. Perhaps Mr Beaudry could inform us of the cost of Ontario's French Language Services Act. Please remember that it is the same pocket that all six levels of government have their hands in. It is not a bottomless pit and taxpayers, unlike politicians, cannot give themselves salary increases.

I have been appalled at the number of self-interest groups that have appeared before this committee. This process should be for the individual person whose main concern is for the welfare of Canada. Also, politicians who have been constantly given the benefit of a platform for putting forward their views and have even been given extra time.

We are constantly reminded that we are and need to be tolerant. This conditioning over the past 20 years has led to too many Canadians bemused about their ability to challenge their leaders or the system. If we had not been so tolerant, we would not have a debt of the amount that we have today.

All Canadians should participate in establishing our future spending priorities. Many current expenses should be slashed until we have got our national debt under control. The groups having special interests which fall outside our priorities will have to be creative in self-funding their own causes.

Conclusion: Canada is in for a tough time. Constitutional crisis, recession, mounting unemployment, national debt and many other concerns will take their toll on us. However, Canadians have known previous hardships and survived many conflicts, including the Great Depression of the 1930s and two world wars. We must stop this constant navel-gazing which has become a national obsession. Canadians must act in a responsible manner and forgo some personal wants for the greater good of a stable and united country.

The Chair: Barbara Yurkoski is next.

Interjection: Mr Chairman, I must rise in protest at this moment after that wonderful presentation by that lady.

The Chair: I am sorry, sir.

Interjection: I am sorry too because I want to speak on behalf of all the people tonight that will not get a chance to speak, sir. An awful lot of money has been put into this and it is being handled very poorly.

The Chair: You are entitled to your opinion, sir. We are going to carry on.

Interjection: I was scheduled to speak at 2 o'clock this afternoon—

The Chair: Sir, we are not going to be able to carry on this way. You are going to sit—

Interjection: Well, we are not going to be able to—

The Chair: Sir, you are going to sit down or you will be escorted out of the room.

Interjection: I am on my way out, sir.

The Chair: All right.

Interjection: I would not rise in protest if I was not. I came here to impeach Brian Mulroney—

The Chair: Brian Mulroney is not here, sir.

Interjection: —and I find myself having to impeach his committee.

The Chair: Sir, please sit down or leave the room. Ms Yurkoski, carry on, please.

Interjection: Sir, I will leave the room at your suggestion and tomorrow I will go to the Ontario Human Rights Commission—

The Chair: You can go wherever you please, sir.

Interjection: —and I will launch a protest that I have been discriminated against as a Canadian citizen by this committee.

The Chair: Sir, we have tried our best to accommodate as many people as possible.

Interjection: You gave me a period of 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The Chair: We did not give you a period of 2 o'clock, sir.

Interjection: Yes, I was.

The Chair: Let's carry on. Ms Yurkoski, go ahead.

Interjection: There are an awful lot of people that were assigned 7 o'clock tonight who will never be able to peak also, sir.

The Chair: I will be calling Anne Adelson next. Go ahead.

Ms Yurkoski: Thank you.

In the booklet prepared by the Ontario government to introduce this committee, the Premier invites us to talk about values. This is a—

Interjection: I apologize to the Canadian taxpayers and the Ontario citizens who are watching at this moment, but this protest—

The Chair: Sir, I really do not want to have you escorted out of the room. Would you please just sit down or leave the room? You are interrupting a speaker.

Interjection: We must accept your schedule—

The Chair: You are interrupting a speaker, sir.

Interjection: I am interrupting the process, sir.

The Chair: Sir, leave please or sit down.

Interjection: I came here and I was scheduled at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I came to speak on behalf of 30,000 people.

The Chair: I am really sorry, sir. I do not want to resort to this, but we cannot have the meeting interrupted in this way.

Interjection: When somebody grabs you, it is an assault. You understand that. Excuse me, I will leave the room on my own speed. Yes, sir.

The Chair: All right. Go ahead.

Interjection: But I will launch that protest with the Ontario Human Rights Commission.

The Chair: Sir, you do whatever you wish. Go ahead.

Interjection: It's a lot of money and a lot of hard work. Do you know how hard people fought for this freedom?

The Chair: Let's try again.

BARBARA YURKOSKI

Ms Yurkoski: In the booklet prepared by the Ontario government to introduce this committee, the Premier invites us to talk about values. This is a difficult topic because it is inherently subjective, but it is an important one because our political institutions incorporate our values. Politicians can provide leadership by making us reflect on these values, but in a democracy the role of politicians and bureaucrats is to apply their political and technical expertise to serve the people. They should not expect to impose their values in a matter as fundamental as constitutional change.

During the Meech Lake debate, the Prime Minister said that without bilingualism Canadians would have no identity. Before I comment on this, I want to make it clear that I accept the special status of the French language and culture in Canada, but when I think of Canada, I think of much more than bilingualism and I am afraid that these other qualities are endangered.

That is why I am taking this opportunity to tell my provincial government about my concerns for the future of Canada.

Canadians are characterized by subdued nationalism, but I think it is a mistake to equate this with a lack of feeling for Canada as a distinct society. To me Canada is a country that combines the American values of freedom and equality with an acceptance of a bigger role for government in improving the quality of life of all its citizens.

It is also a country with a real respect for individual, cultural and political differences, a country where diversity of opinion is respected, and until recently has been seen as a peacemaker and a country with an independent thoughtful foreign policy.

A country is not a magical entity but the sum of its people and their values, and if people's thinking and circumstances change, the nature of the country can change. It seems to me that Canada has been changing in some ways for the worst.

In particular, I sense that concern for the quality of life of all Canadians is being replaced by calculating self-interest and that many of our political leaders have become role models for this ideology. Even Confederation is treated as little more than an economic union to be discarded if there is no economic gain for the individual province.

As my contribution to this committee's attempt to understand the values of Canadians, there are three points that I want to emphasize.

First, I do not admire politicians who treat political life as a high-stakes poker game, nor do I admire those who

use a utilitarian cost-benefit analysis to assess political issues as if they were not affecting the lives of human beings. I want political leaders to show concern for the quality of life of all Canadians, to combine an awareness of practical realities with an understanding of human needs and a vision of human possibilities.

Second, I want to be a citizen, not a subject. I was deeply angered by the high-pressure tactics employed in the Meech Lake affair and by the attempt to label all those who were concerned about the accord's effects on Canada as bigots. I do not want to see fundamental constitutional issues decided in federal-provincial conferences where politicians who are elected to deal with provincial matters are insulated from the wishes of the electorate. Senate reform, referenda, forums such as this one and perhaps a constituent assembly are viable ways to give people more input into government.

1940

Finally, my third point, while some change in our political structure is unavoidable, the federal government must retain the political and economic powers that make Canada a nation. I wish that Canadians would accept the historical, legal and social reasons for giving the French language special status in Canada, and I understand that lacking this acceptance, Quebec must have special powers to preserve its language, but I am opposed to any plans to transfer to all the provinces the kind of powers Quebec is demanding.

I do not have time to go into detail about the federal-provincial division of powers, and in any case I am not an expert in this area, but I believe it is important to distinguish between, on the one hand, the goal of increasing the role of the provinces and regions in matters that directly affect their lives, and on the other hand, the consequences of encouraging regional thinking, special interests and counterproductive competition between governments.

The federal government must have the power to maintain standards for social programs and to co-ordinate development if Canada is to be a nation.

The Chair: Can you sum up, madam.

Ms Yurkoski: I am. I do not claim to have anything original or surprising to say to this committee. In fact, I hope what I have said is not surprising at all, and I hope that you are hearing it from so many people that it cannot be ignored. I hope that a substantial number of Canadians see their country as more than a union of economic advantage and that this committee will hear from people who want to continue to build a country in which bilingualism is only one of the qualities that makes them happy to be Canadian.

WILLOWDALE NDP
FEDERAL CONSTITUENCY ASSOCIATION

The Chair: Could I call next Anne Adelson, and following Ms Adelson, I will call Julio Schincariol.

Ms Adelson: I am speaking on behalf of the Willowdale NDP Federal Constituency Association. One of the earlier speakers suggested that special interest groups or political parties are somehow suspect. We think that our involvement in politics is a demonstration of our concern and our commitment to the issues over the years.

So without discounting the value of individual contributions, we think that groups have a part to play as well.

We are responding to your invitation to discuss a new Canada. We agree with your characterization that Canada is at the crossroads. The crossroads, as we see it, pose both unique dangers to the future but also unique opportunities for development. Certainly we do not see the status quo as an option any more. But we would like to consider the present situation and we believe that this constitutional crisis that we have now was neither inevitable nor necessary and it was caused by the current federal government.

Unfortunately the Meech Lake fiasco has caused rift and exacerbated tensions in Canada to such an extent that we truly wonder if we still have the necessary consensus of values to keep the country together. These threats to our nationhood are coming in the context of an increasingly competitive economy globally and a federal government whose political agenda appears totally tied to continental integration.

But beyond the dangers we see opportunities. Someone remarked recently that Mulroney has achieved what no previous Prime Minister in Canada has been able to do and that is to politicize the Canadian public. Maybe we can recognize that the original consensus that allowed Confederation was a negative one, not American, and perhaps now this current situation is acting as a catalyst for Canadians to really discuss the values we share.

At this point, I must say I agreed with a lot of what the previous speaker said and I think a number of Canadians are searching for values. Certainly we do not want to see Canada break up or Quebec leave Confederation. Some of us feel that the survivability of any parts of a divided Canada are less secure than others, but we certainly share a desire to keep Canada together.

We like the way that you have characterized the discussion around values because we think that values are what define Canada. We should continue to support and pursue the values that we have established, like sharing the wealth, economic management to serve the needs of people, protection of the rights of minority groups and minimum standards of basic necessities for all Canadians.

When you look at Canada, it really does not make sense as a geographical or economic unit and it does not really meet the definition of a nation-state either, so it only makes sense politically. If we stay together, it is primarily on the basis of our shared values. We believe that the new Canada will be based on this common vision we develop through dialogue.

We also feel that the fact that Canada is not a finished product is actually an advantage rather than a problem. There is a great potential in being an unfinished, young adolescent country, and we hope that the model that we can become in maturity will be a positive one for the world. We think the world needs Canada badly.

We think we could set an example for the world to create a nation where at least two, French and English nations can live in harmony, and we think it would be a terrible pity if we could not get it together in Canada. Where else can they do it? We really feel this strong need to do that. We also think we could provide a great impetus

to international understanding and co-operation if we really dealt with the multicultural face of Canada.

Democracy is a principle very important to Canadians. A number of the speakers have said this before, and certainly dealing with the Constitution we want to make sure the Constitution belongs to the people and not the politicians. I have to add a note here. We applaud your contribution through these hearings and through the discussion paper. We feel that we should not have treated the overwhelming public response as such a problem, rather see it as the need that exists. I was upset that that man had to be escorted out by the police and I hope in the future we can look for more creative solutions to people really wanting to speak. One of the solutions is one that you have taken up tonight, which was splitting the commission into two groups. It seemed like a logical idea to us.

We would like to see Canada become more independent and also more interdependent on other countries besides just the United States. We need more self-sufficiency in our national economy and we believe one way we can do this is through a much bigger immigration policy, together with a commitment to absorb new immigrants and tackle the problems of racism.

As far as the roles of the federal and provincial governments are concerned, we believe there is a need for a strong central government to speak up for the nation as a whole, and to encourage and preserve national unity and to uphold the values and principles we share for all Canadians, no matter where they live.

We also believe that the present federal government has failed dismally on all these counts and has divided Canadians as never before, French against English, women against men, the different provinces against each other, the aboriginal people against the rest of Canada. We have seen our national institutions demolished, and these were institutions that were created to enhance Canadian unity. I am thinking of the CBC, Via Rail and now Terminal 3 at Pearson International Airport.

The other thing that causes us alarm is the spending cuts in transfer payments just announced in the budget by Michael Wilson. We feel these cuts are bound to exacerbate regional divisions and also that they pose very real threats to essential programs for Canadians. Surely this is one of the most important of our shared values.

The Chair: You are going to have to sum up.

Ms Adelson: Okay. We think there should be a law against this. In fact, we think some values and principles are so important to Canadians that they should be entrenched in the Constitution, not left to particular governments to treat them or not treat them, as they will. We believe the Constitution is something that no government in Canada should be allowed to use for its own political purposes. It belongs to the people. It has been built up with our values we have created over the years, and we certainly do not want to see a repeat of the kind of crisis we have now through inept management by government.

1950

JULIO SCHINCARIOL

The Chair: I call then next Julio Schincariol, and following Mr Schincariol I will call David Louie. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Schincariol: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and hello to all of the committee members. Thank you very much for allowing me this time to present.

I know the committee has been travelling for the last month and listening to people all over Ontario and hearing their concerns on the French-English language issue and aboriginal issues, and all of these issues seem to look at language rights specifically.

However, deaf people in Ontario really feel very much left out of the discussion. We are talking about spoken languages, French, English, aboriginal languages, and yet there is a group of people who are very separate from that who are also Canadians who are deaf, and we share very serious concerns about our own language and our own culture.

The Canadian Association for the Deaf was founded in 1904. Dr Verditz at that time said, "As long as we have deaf people on earth, we will have sign language," and that quote talks about language rights and has been a part of our history for over a hundred years. I think the time is right now for me to come here and speak to all of you and to emphasize to the committee this issue.

Maybe you are aware of some of these points and maybe you are not. Through your travels across the province, I know you have heard a variety of different people and I know deaf people have spoken to you as well, so you may be familiar with some of what I am going to say tonight. However, I feel I need to follow up and also to speak myself.

1. Government communication and accessibility is a must. We must have that provided in American sign language. Often you see government publications and advertisements in a variety of different languages, Greek, Italian, French, yet nothing is put out in American sign language, there is nothing available for us. When I talk about sign language, I mean both American sign language and LSQ, langue des signes québécoise.

2. In any government business issues, interpreters must be provided. It is not only for the benefit of deaf people. Interpreters benefit both deaf and hearing people, allowing us to get together and to communicate with each other.

3. TV programs that are government-funded should have interpreters in both ASL and LSQ provided. There should be full access to government-funded TV programs. Often we see programs that are funded and there is absolutely no way for deaf people to access that information. We too want to know what is going on in the world.

4. Deaf and hearing people pay the same taxes. However, information access is certainly greatly unequal. Why are we paying the same taxes if we cannot access the services? I would recommend that the government establish a committee that includes deaf people as well as government representatives to talk about communication accessibility.

ASL and LSQ are a fact of deaf people, and it is time the government recognized those languages. The government does not understand what ASL and LSQ are. They do not respect the language and they do not respect our culture, so we are very separate. Again I would recommend the establishment of a committee that would look into the possibility of having ASL and LSQ and deaf culture entrenched in legal terms, similar to Bill 8.

The general public in Ontario, of course, uses telephones to communicate, as I am sure everybody sitting around here does. Italian people can use the phone, other cultures can pick up a phone and call people, but deaf people cannot. We have to pay additional money out of our own pocket to pay for TTYs. That again is not equal access. I would recommend that Bell Canada be told that it must provide a telecommunications device for the deaf to deaf people so we are only paying for the same service and the phone system is accessible to us also.

On the issue of education, which, of course, is a very critical issue for deaf children in Ontario, I think we can draw parallels between francophone children and deaf children. I would recommend that we establish a system that allows deaf children to have access to education through ASL and LSQ, just as francophone children are allowed into schools where courses are taught in French; it includes their language, includes their culture. That is a model that should be used for deaf education also so that we can have our language and culture used in the school.

But then we move on to university-level education. The only place there is a university for deaf people is in the United States, so Canadian students wanting to go to university are forced to go to the States to get that education. Canada has no such facility for deaf people. I would recommend that we establish a university where students can access classrooms and classroom information in ASL and LSQ at a university level and that that should be done in Ontario.

The deaf community's perspective and the medical professional's perspective on cochlear implants are in complete opposition. I would recommend that a government committee be established that has representatives from both the medical profession and the deaf community to look at the ethical and moral issues and that both of these representatives be involved. Young deaf children are currently being implanted with these cochlear devices, yet there is absolutely no substantial proof that in any way it enhances their lives, so I would recommend that we put a moratorium on the continuation of implanting young deaf children.

The recommendations I have brought up this evening reflect very serious concerns by deaf people in Ontario, and I would ask you to respect their language and respect their culture in the same way that other languages and cultures are respected in this country. Thank you.

DAVID LOUIE

The Chair: I call next David Louie, and following Mr Louie, Alex Perlman.

Mr Louie: The party line does not belong in a democracy. Elected officials must be accountable to the people who elected them. Representation must be fair and equal for all regions of Canada.

1. Let every native reserve be its own riding for a seat in the House of Commons.

2. Senate elections shall be held exactly two years after federal elections.

3. Every candidate for a seat in the House of Commons in the Senate or in the Legislative Assembly shall run as an independent, with no affiliation to any political party. There shall be no political parties in the federal, provincial or municipal levels of government.

4. Elected members of Parliament shall hold two votes: one to select the Prime Minister and one to select the Speaker of the House. The runner-up to the Prime Minister-elect will become the Leader of the Opposition.

5. The Prime Minister will form the government by choosing members of the Parliament to be in his cabinet. The Leader of the Opposition will do likewise to form the shadow cabinet. The rest of the MPs will hold the balance of power.

6. In the Senate one vote shall be held, and that is to select the Speaker.

7. Senators shall align themselves from bill to bill according to the opinions of their constituents.

Pat Carney has recently proven that party members do not always agree with party policies. When Lucie Bouchard was sitting on the government side of the House of Commons, he defended the government's policy of high interest rates. Now, sitting on the opposition side, he criticizes it. Alex Kindy and David Kilgour have proven the party-line politics and constituency representation do not mix well in the present government. It rules by party line not by constituency representation. The 10 December by-elections have proven that, by midterm, opinion is changed. This is why I propose Senate elections two years after the federal elections.

My proposal emphasizes constituency representation which is democracy. Elected members answer to their electorate only. My proposal forces every candidate running for a seat in the House of Commons to have his or her own national policy. Each member, from native to separatist, has an equal chance to become Prime Minister. Therefore his policies must address Canada nationally and regionally. Party puppies, such as Harvie André, Kim Campbell, Benoît Bouchard and Mary Collins, will become obsolete because they will not be able to stand on their own.

No bill shall pass through the House of Commons with the same ease that the free trade agreement, the unemployment insurance bill, the goods and services tax, the Meech Lake accord and the abortion bill did. Our armed forces would not have been so hastily committed to war. I do not care if these policies of the Tory government are good and would make Canada into the most successful country in the world. The arrogance of his ministers and the fact that Mulroney rules by dictatorial decree are blatant abuses of democracy.

When alcoholic fisheries ministers sell off fishing rights to other nations, when rancid tuna is accepted and passed on to consumers, when the business development minister gives loans to strip joints while explaining that the GST is needed to fight the deficit, when junkies become senators, when cabinet ministers resign in the face of scandal

knowing they will later be promoted, and when the Prime Minister's wife takes \$10,000 air trips to Europe on taxpayers' money, we citizens must seriously reconsider the privileges of the people who run this country.

000

My proposal focuses on making the government accountable to the people who elected it. I am not satisfied that calling another election will be the answer to Canada's frustration, because the mechanism of party-line rule is still ingrained in our system of government. I do not point the finger specifically at either Jean Chrétien or Audrey McLaughlin, that they will rule Canada as tyrannically as the present leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, but I do stress that the potential is there as long as the party system is the basis for governing Canada. Imagine if Peter Pocklington had won the 1983 Tory leadership race.

The most fundamental mistake Canada can make is to have education under provincial jurisdiction. The province is governed by regional requirements. Education is a national concern. It is taken seriously in Japan, Korea and Sweden, to name a few countries. Even communist China and Nazi Germany know the importance of education. In Canada, in Ontario, we trivialize the education system by trading schools between the public and private sector as if they were hockey cards or items in a flea market.

Graduates from Quebec are required to successfully pass all their courses in the French language without English-language requirements. Graduates from British Columbia are required to successfully pass all their courses in the English language without French-language requirements. The learning and teaching of another language is a learning, teaching and understanding of another culture. The single most important subject, without intending to sacrifice math, science or history, is that of languages.

My proposal is this:

1. The public education system shall be a federal responsibility.
2. English and French shall be taught concurrently, but in two separate classes beginning in grade 1.
3. Teachers shall be free to choose any of the official languages to instruct.
4. Other languages should be offered as optional courses.

In an overview of national unity, the decentralization of the federal powers and the separation of Quebec bring the integration of the rest of Canada and its absorption into the United States. I am not being irresponsible by stating this. I am putting out what will be. This is the goal of the American-funded PC Party of Canada. Look at the effects and ramifications of PC policies. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Louie.

ALEX PERLMAN

The Chair: Alex Perlman. Following Mr Perlman, I will call Gordon Turnbull.

Mr Perlman: Good evening. I understand I have five minutes to present to the committee. What I would like to do is to leave some time in case there are any questions, so you understand what I am trying to present.

Basically, my presentation has to do with democratic reform. The way I have characterized our current system is one of periodic democracy. It seems to me that it is periodic because we have the opportunity every four or five years—sometimes more often, but generally in that period—to elect a new federal government, similarly a provincial government. Also, we have our municipal elections periodically. As we all know, many promises are made in an election campaign, many of which are not fulfilled. But once a majority government is elected, the public has very little power to do anything to change what is taking place. We have just seen that in terms of the GST. We all know the majority of the Canadian public was against it, yet it went through, and I do not see that as being democracy.

What I am suggesting is a form of ongoing democratic process whereby the constituency at each level of government has the power to directly affect government policy. I do not know what kind of percentage would be looked at. Obviously, it will be a maximum of 50.1%, but I think some smaller percentage would be more practical in terms of a group of the population putting forth its views, either being opposed to some government policy that is now in effect or being proposed, or proposing a new policy, so that in a situation such as the one I have pointed out with the GST, where you have a majority of the public against it, they can voice their opinion through a petition or some other means, and that a process can be set up so a referendum can be held.

I give in my outline here an example of a process that could be used. With the technology we have at this time, it would be very easy to facilitate that process by giving each voting person a personal identification number with which they vote in combination with their social insurance number on toll-free telephone lines and bypass the great cost we undergo each time there is an election. In this way, they could voice their views about a policy that is going to be imposed or to change something which is currently in effect.

The last section I have has to do with information obviously. The government of Canada said many times: "The public doesn't understand the GST. That's why they're against it." I personally find that to be an affront to my intelligence. I read the documents very carefully, I understood them better than a lot of people on the information lines, and I was very much opposed to it.

The information sessions I am suggesting would make some means available, whether it is through the CBC—hopefully it will still exist—but some means whereby people who are for a certain policy and people who are against a certain policy can make those views known so that all of the public can be well informed and thereby make their vote and not have to wait until another election. Mulroney says, "Three or four years down the road people will change their mind." Even though now he might only have 15% popularity, what is he going to do three years down the road? We have all seen spending rise prior to an election. Is this any way to run a country?

The proposal I am making has to do with giving input all along the way so that in fact it is an ongoing democracy. I welcome any questions or comments here.

The Chair: We will be able to allow one very brief question and a very brief answer.

Mr Offer: Mr Perlman, thank you. We have heard many presentations dealing with the whole question of referenda. Briefly, do you see any potential difficulty when one uses a referendum in a matter where the policy revolves around the protection of a minority interest?

Mr Perlman: I was thinking about that, and my view is that in our country people value the rights of the individual, and certainly the minority has to be protected. There is no guarantee in our current form of government that the minority is going to be protected, and I think that question is relevant in the current form of government just as well as it would be in referenda. I think the information in terms of voting for or against an issue must incorporate that point.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

GORDON TURNBULL

The Chair: Gordon Turnbull. Following Mr Turnbull, I will call Patrick Kutney.

Mr Turnbull: Mr Chairman and members of the select committee, I was unable to reduce my paper to five minutes, therefore I will submit my paper and will speak only about the major items that are contained therein.

In my opinion, one Constitution must be developed that is acceptable to most Canadian citizens whether they are French, English, aboriginal or immigrants from other countries. The Constitution must apply equally to all people from Newfoundland to British Columbia and from the US border to the tip of the Arctic. The concept of equality to all citizens in all 10 provinces and two territories is the mandatory concept that I feel must be embodied clearly in the Constitution. Inequalities such as the Meech Lake fiasco are not acceptable.

In Ontario, we have for generations tried to teach all of the students French and English to promote bilingualism. When I was at Jarvis Collegiate 38 years ago, we were taught both languages. Our travels to Quebec and French areas of Ontario showed that this knowledge was inadequate; therefore, when our children came along, we voted for French instruction starting in grade 1. All four of my children have finished this curriculum.

At the same time as we in Ontario were trying to teach our children about the French language and culture, we read in the newspapers and see on television that Quebec is passing laws prohibiting students from speaking English in the halls of their schools. Laws are passed in Quebec prohibiting businesses from putting up signs that are not in the French language. The federal government does absolutely nothing to ensure that the English people living in Quebec have equal rights; therefore, we have an exodus of English who choose to flee rather than put up with these laws.

2010

This is not the equality we want for Canada. The revelations in front of this committee of Mr Mulroney's "Franco bank" are shocking, to say the least. This discrimination by the federal government is definitely not the equality we want for Canada.

If special status is going to be negotiated for Quebec then I feel that special status must be negotiated for the remaining nine provinces and two territories. In my opinion special status for Quebec or any province is unacceptable.

Government leadership: The time has come for governments at all levels to start to lead instead of bowing down to all citizens and non-citizens who have nice-to-have shopping lists. Governments must realize that there is a limit to how much money we can pay them. In 1990, the Fraser Institute stated that we worked until 8 July just to pay taxes. With the addition of only the 7% GST and the 1% additional provincial tax, the people of Ontario worked in 1991 until the middle of July just to pay tax. This is outrageous and shows a complete lack of leadership by the government. The time has come for all levels of government to cut back on spending or they are going to face a general tax revolt.

Therefore, the revised Constitution must include a means to reduce the term of office of politicians such as Mulroney and Wilson before they completely destroy Canada.

The Senate: The recent passing of the GST by the federal government and by the Senate has highlighted the fact that the Senate is a useless body that is nothing more than a place to put patronage appointments. The fact that appointments continue as long as a person lives is outrageous. The Senate may only need to be overhauled, with some suggestions such as equal representation from each province having merit. However, in my opinion the Senate is a totally useless part of the bureaucracy that should be eliminated with the new Constitution.

Symbolism: Colonial days are long over and the time has come for Ontario to have its own flag that does not have the Union Jack or the coat of arms. The flag should be distinctive, such as Quebec's, and should not contain any symbols from the English monarchy. This would be a good way to start with the new Constitution.

Trade: If we are to continue the existing trade arrangements that provide such an enormous part of our economy I feel some corrections must be made, and I am only going to pick out two:

Items that are imported into Ontario from countries, provinces and states that do not have environmental protection laws at least comparable to ours should be charged a percentage environmental charge that would go directly to our program and help reduce the burden on our industries. This charge would be a variable amount depending on the differences in legislation.

Countries, provinces and states that do not have similar worker protection codes and worker protection system should similarly have a charge on items imported into Ontario, with the proceeds going directly into the worker compensation fund. It is totally unacceptable that jobs should be lost to outside manufacturers who do not have similar laws to Ontario's.

The Chair: You are going to have to sum up.

Mr Turnbull: Okay. Just one last thing. Quebec after separation: The people of Quebec should be told that they do have something to lose. Quebec must take its share of the national debt. Quebec ought to be told that it no longer

will be getting billion-dollar equalization payments. The south shore of Quebec should not be transferred to the new country, as a link such as this must be kept by the rest of Canada so we can continue without Quebec. The area of Quebec around Hull that houses the federal government buildings must remain in Canada. An audit must be completed of all federal government properties and lands. Payments must be made to Canada for the appraised value. No consideration should be given to turning over Labrador to his new country. Agreements made between Newfoundland and Quebec regarding hydroelectric power should be voided.

Mr Chairman, thank you for allowing me to present my ideas before the select committee.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

PATRICK KUTNEY

The Chair: Patrick Kutney, and John Sommers will be next.

Mr Kutney: I can race through this and get through it in five minutes, or if you want I could be more leisurely and take about six. Your choice.

The Chair: We prefer that you not race through it because it does cause problems for the interpreters. If you could trim some of it and give us salient points, that would be preferred.

Mr Kutney: Okay. I feel like a firefighter who can only save one child from a burning school. In five minutes will try to deal with just a couple of aspects with regard to Ontario, Canada and the Constitution.

The role of this committee and this province in continuing Confederation is of monumental importance. The national perspective will have to come from the various provincial commissions, as the Spicer commission is so badly structured that the chance of something meaningful coming out of it are bleak. We are asked to meet in discussion groups to answer their 14 questions, many of which have little to do with addressing the mess we are in. An in-depth analysis is impossible and most answers will be lib. There is no opportunity to meet with commissioners and the chances of a brief being read are remote. It is consensus on a shallow level. Anything out of the norm will be rejected before it even gets to the commissioners.

This committee will give its interim report on 21 March and a final report, I believe, in June or July. What happens in spring? I hope we can learn at some point tonight or in the next few days how this committee will function until summer. There is widespread consensus that the closed-door policy of constitutional negotiations is not acceptable. We can never go back to the way it was. The way Ontario is going about it thus far is the way to go. In the Meech Lake talks, the time for having committees, listening to the electorate, was between Meech Lake and the Kevin O'Rourke Block.

The select committee on Ontario in Confederation will be considered a closed-door committee if it does not reject the briefs put before it. It will be a closed-door committee if the report consists solely of the committee members' preconceived notions of what Canada's reality is

and what its future should be. It will also be a closed-door process if it embodies the line of your respective leaders or that of your federal counterparts. This committee must accept the intelligent, reasoned recommendations of the public and discard those briefs from special-interest groups that are born of self-interest and those briefs that rise from racism or bigotry. By acquiescing to your leader if his line of thought differs from that of us, you may curry his favour until the next election but you may sacrifice the country.

As elected officials we accept that you govern as you see fit on almost all subjects. We may complain and lobby and punish you at the ballot box on legislation we feel strongly about, but the future of Canada in constitutional terms is no longer your exclusive purview. We are partners now and we, the public, must be consulted and listened to at every step in the constitutional process. We expect you to invite us again after the interim report comes out. We are all working for the preservation of Canada and one that includes Quebec as a province equal with the others.

Now I will turn to Quebec, the flashpoint of the whole debate. It has not been proved—and the feeble attempts have been scarce—that the francophones of Quebec have been ill served by Confederation and the federal government. On the contrary, it has been past Quebec provincial governments under the premierships of Duplessis and before him Taschereau who repressed the dreams and aspirations of the francophones of Quebec. To some extent the church and English business leaders of the past also relegated the Quebec francophone to servitude. A few decades ago the language of the Quebec civil service was English.

The rejection of Meech Lake was not a rejection of Quebec by so-called English Canada. It was a rejection of special powers for one province; a further devolution of federal powers to the provinces; the threat to the equality provision of the 1981 Constitution; the threat to shared-cost programs; the ambiguity of the court, etc. The hate that is generated towards Quebec is really misguided. It is not the Québécois who are scorned but inward-looking Quebec provincial politicians, the academics, the francophone media and some of the federal politicians, the so-called élite.

What is the unilingual francophone in that province to think when he is bombarded with brutal messages of rejection or that English Canada does not care? On that matter, try to find English Canadian dailies or Maclean's or Saturday Night in most places. You cannot buy them, but you can get US dailies or Time or Newsweek or People.

Despite some politicians' assertions to the contrary the Quebec government cannot negotiate bilaterally with the federal government on constitutional matters. The other provinces must be at the table. I would welcome the input of the first nations and the territories at the table.

The Ontario committee and government must reach out to Quebec. We love Quebec and we want it to stay in Canada, but not under sovereignty-association. Do you accept a Quebec that can decide in the federal government what legislation it does not like that deals only with the other nine provinces? Nor is giving most federal powers to the provinces the solution. This argument is more difficult in view of the ongoing cuts in transfer payments, but this

government is very unpopular and will not be there for eternity. Canada is already approaching unworkable.

2020

I am reminded of an incident during the 1987 provincial election. A friend of mine, who was an MP at the time, was lobbying an Ontario cabinet minister to reject Meech Lake. That minister's reply was: "How can I say no? They"—meaning the feds—"gave us the store." You may be able to run our province better than the federal government, but you are dreaming in Technicolor if you think you can run the rest of the country better. Separation is hardly more palatable. The unravelling of the rest of Canada would, I fear, be inevitable.

The Chair: Thank you. Let me just make a comment, sir, to you and to all the others who are here, that we also understand very much the need for the process of discussion to continue. In direct answer to your question about the second part of the process, it will include some form of continued dialogue with the people of the province. We have not structured it yet, but we know we need to do that and we will be doing that.

JOHN SOMMERS

The Chair: John Sommers, and following Mr Sommers, Ron Lamb.

Mr Sommers: Mr Chairman and members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, Premier Rae provided interesting information and questions in the booklet titled *Changing for the Better*. As a provincial Premier, Bob Rae is looking for an Ontarian response. I personally feel the problem is much larger and prefer to address my response as a Canadian who by choice lives in the province of Ontario.

First, let me say there is too much government. There is too much duplication of effort by both elected members of the various levels of government and their bureaucracies. The result: high cost of governing which does not always meet the needs of the people and the country.

On the provincial and federal level there is very little spirit of co-operation. For the opposition the name of the game is to discredit the government at every opportunity, rather than offering constructive criticism and alternative proposals worthy of debate. By the same token, government takes the attitude that only it knows what is needed, and it dislikes to consider anything proposed by the opposition. While municipal councils are not elected along party lines, they tend to form support groups within themselves: "If you support me, I'll support you."

These methods are not right for Canada. When one watches some of our elected members in action on TV or reads their comments in the press, one wonders if they are not hindering the democratic process rather than making a positive contribution on behalf of the citizens they represent. As to the Senate, it is seen to be totally out of touch and unnecessary.

Under this scenario, how can one expect Canadians to feel? We live in one of the most highly taxed countries in the industrialized world, yet per capita our deficit is higher than that for most other industrialized countries; as a matter of fact, higher than that of some Third World countries.

Yes, Canada, for these reasons and those still to be mentioned, is ready for a new Constitution. Everything must be on the table and nothing should be sacred. In a country with the geographic breadth of Canada and some what limited population, is there any advantage in having 10 provinces plus two territories, particularly when some of the smaller ones rely so heavily on federal transfer payments? I suggest it would benefit the regions and the country as a whole if, for example, the Maritimes and Newfoundland become one province. They would reduce administrative expenses and, representing a much larger population, would probably win more battles with Ottawa collectively than they now do individually. It might also encourage a greater level of co-operation between the provinces.

The new Constitution must ensure that the governing parties in both federal and provincial governments represent at least 50% of the votes cast. Federally, to make this possible, some provinces may have to lose seats while others might gain seats. Any loss of seats could be offset through an elected Senate. The new Constitution is one which would foster a new degree of co-operation between the various levels of government to assist in developing a truly national identity.

There are some areas over which the federal government should have exclusive responsibility, such as monetary policy, defence and trade. Other areas such as health, pensions, immigration, welfare and education should be the joint responsibility of the federal government and the provinces. Together they would establish direction and goals. The federal government would raise the funds for these programs through taxes and special levies such as the CPP and make transfer payments to the provinces that they might implement these joint programs.

What impact would these changes have?

1. Reduced direct federal responsibility resulting in fewer ministries and reduced bureaucracies.

2. Increased direct responsibility for the provinces.

3. National standards of education, ensuring equal opportunity and mobility of students between provinces. Education programs geared to meet the needs of the 1990s that Canada might have its fair share of research and high tech positions, without which Canada could become a have-not country.

4. In this scenario there would no longer be a role for locally elected school trustees.

5. Reduced costs would enable governments to allocate more dollars to reducing their deficits, which over the long term would mean lower taxes.

6. The establishment of a capital district encompassing those areas which are predominantly home to government. Both Ontario and Quebec would be asked to cede these lands to a new district which might be known as Ottawa Hull, the capital of Canada. This new capital would belong to all Canadians with a locally elected council to be responsible for municipal affairs.

Time does not permit me to go into some of the other areas, but I hope you will have a chance to read my complete presentation. In closing, I would say that in spite of the fact that Ontario would seem to be the most heavily

xed province, it is still a great province within Canada in which to live. Change is in the wind, and Ontario, together with other provinces, territories and native people, will have to work together to find a solution. It will be a matter of give and take if we hope to hold this country together.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

RON LAMB

The Chair: Ron Lamb, and following Mr Lamb, Helen and Bill Robson.

Mr Lamb: I would like to take the opportunity to thank you, first, for allowing me to have the time. I guess I know what you would call one of those special-interest groups: It is called Let's Just Quit, which is a society that says let's just quit bickering and fighting, let's get on with the job of building the country. I believe that someplace along the line we have to get on with the job. I think we have to look at Ontario as a future country too, and I think we are going to really have to look at Ontario taking the lead and being the mainstay of Canada after Quebec leaves confederation.

I have done some cost checking. For TVOntario services alone it is \$66 million a year for 6,000 hours a year in French and 6,000 hours a year in English. If you take the \$66-million budget given to TVOntario by this government and you break it down into viewers, counting every person viewed, the cost for the French side would be 19,000 per person a year. If you break it down on the English side, it would be \$4 a year. Those figures were applied today by the CEO of TVO.

So let's get on with the job. One of the areas we think we have to get into is that we are really going to have to start feeding our people; or the area of sending people to work. We believe Ontario wants to propose in the new Constitution equal rights for women and men; that a Prime Minister of Canada be born in Canada; that there be a mechanism embedded in the Constitution for the impeachment of the Prime Minister, senators, premiers and cabinet ministers. Examples might be a dereliction of duty to office, treason, embezzling, war crimes and murder. We also believe all votes in both houses at the federal level and also all votes in the provincial governments should be free votes.

030

We would like to see a Senate formed with two members from each province elected, with equal powers to the House of Commons. You may say, "Well, we will go on with the dichotomy where either side would be stalemated." No. I believe that if it came to the point where it took 60% of the people in the Senate to pass a bill, people would look a little longer before they put a bill before it, even before the House.

Increasingly, we are seeing governments at all levels doing what they think is best for the people, instead of what the people tell the governments to do. We as Ontarians value our politicians only as long as politicians do as they are directed by the democratic system.

How can we Ontarians secure our future in the international economy? We can secure our future in the international economy by being more creative in the sciences, physics, mathematics, electronic engineering. Also, we

have to develop excellent skills for marketing products created and extremely stringent quality control requirements. We can seek our future in the international economy by developing our own huge depositions of natural resources. We can secure our future in the international economy by allowing the marketplace to decide which products have to be labelled in what languages. All one has to do is to look at the Japanese market to learn one very important fact: The Japanese do not require their manufacturers to label all products in two languages in their home markets.

What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? The federal government does not have a role. How does the federal government have a role when it is \$400 billion in debt? They are bankrupt, morally and financially. Some of the figures I have in front of me also—if I might just go to an aside for a second. The 200,000 Iraqis that were killed in Iraq—it cost us in the neighbourhood of \$1.2 billion. So every Iraqi who was killed, looking at a cost factor, it was \$5,000 per head.

The Ontario government's role is to lead by example. The Ontario government should introduce legislation on a minimum 22% tax and no write-offs. Do away with the 8% sales tax and a 7% GST and allow the social net to fund the people who require assistance. The Ontario government should be bringing the educational training levels up beyond any that we have seen to this point.

The Chair: Sir, would you sum up, please.

Mr Lamb: We have to better fund apprenticeship programs. We also have to stop paving, concreting and grassing over our agricultural lands. Above all things, we have to be able to feed ourselves. Increasingly, we are becoming dependent on offshore food imports. There again, I would like to break away from my notes for a second.

The Chair: Sir, you are going to have to do it very quickly.

Mr Lamb: Very. I would like to suggest that in the case of land speculation, houses, a person has to stay in a house a minimum of three years. If that person sells the house within that three-year period of time, a 25% surtax be put on it. That would stop the burgeoning growth of development of the agricultural lands in southern Ontario.

How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?

The Chair: I am going to have to cut you off at that point.

Mr Lamb: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

HELEN AND BILL ROBSON

The Chair: Could I invite next Helen and Bill Robson. Following that presentation, I will be calling Mrs Vera Walton.

Mrs Robson: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee, fellow Canadians, a state of crisis seems to be a constant Canadian characteristic. At the same time, tradition and history seem to lead many Canadians to take a wait-and-see attitude, expecting that things will work out or be worked out for them. But thoughtful Canadians have

to be alarmed by recent developments which threaten the country and our wellbeing to a greater extent than is commonly realized.

The upsurge of separatism in Quebec, spurred by the rest of the country's apparent rejection last June, is the most obvious threat to Canada's existence. Equally disturbing is the mounting irritation with Quebec among other previously uncommitted Canadians. Perhaps worst of all is the growing sense on all sides that the country is not worth the fight, that we might as well give up and that painless separation is possible. We believe that they are most definitely wrong.

We would like to emphasize what is right with Canada as it is. Canada is one of the world's most favoured countries. It is democratic. It has a history of openness, high standards of opportunity and freedom, a history of evolutionary rather than revolutionary political and social change, a deep respect for and faith in the rule of law, a society marked by tolerance and opportunity for merit to advance. We have an energetic, hardworking, productive population, mostly made up of immigrants and their descendants. Also, we have a bilingual nature which, imperfect though it may be, is one of the country's most important characteristics and in fact a precious asset. In short, it is a country well worth preserving whole.

At the same time, we cannot ignore what is wrong with the nation, with the state of Confederation. Quebec has its grievances, and we know that to be one of the foremost problems at this time, but the nationalist tide rises and ebbs. Much of the current feeling in Quebec is a short-term reaction to the failure of the Meech Lake accord. There is diversity in Quebec. It is not a society that has turned its back en masse to the rest of Canada. Some sort of recognition of Quebec's distinctness is going to be required, unpalatable though that may be to many Canadians, including ourselves.

At the same time, the growing strength of the Reform Party in the three westernmost provinces is a clear signal that other parts of the country share Quebec's frustrations. These frustrations reflect a belief that the policies of the central government are not responsive to the desires and needs of people outside central Canada, which brings us to our first main point, that there is a declining sense of community throughout the country, as particularist sentiment reigns in Canada.

The next main point is that Ontario seems to be the odd province out. From Ontario's perspective, is it not striking that many of the grievances expressed by both Quebec and the west arise from issues on which they have found themselves in opposition to Ontario. We believe the emphasis of the select committee on the social and economic interests and aspirations of the people of Ontario may be slightly misplaced.

If Ontario cannot benefit from Confederation without making losers of other parties to the contract, we will in the end have very little to discuss. Ontarians would be better advised to enter a new round of constitutional discussions asking not only what Canada can do for Ontario but also what Ontario can do for Canada.

Mr Robson: This is a tag team effort. One of the reasons that we feel regional squabbles are so frequent and fierce in Canada is that we have no way of dealing with them in our representative institutions. Instead, we have come to depend on a process of executive federalism—federal-provincial conferences for constitutional change and minor details as well. There is no accountability to the process and there is no political legitimacy to its results. A clear example of that was one of the key points in the minds of many opponents of the Meech Lake accord: it was the process by which it was reached. The people involved had no mandate to do what they did.

Executive federalism also tends to produce an agenda that is framed in terms of the competing interests of the federal and provincial governments. The possible role of municipal governments in enhancing Canadians' lives is completely overlooked and the character of a Constitution as a contract between the government and the governed is totally lost to view.

The situation of aboriginal peoples in Canada is obviously a very complex and emotional one, with a lot of right on both sides, but one thing that is safe to say is that the existing division of federal, provincial and municipal powers does not leave a niche in which it is easy to solve these problems.

What we feel is necessary in order to break this logjam would be a constituent assembly, and in order to produce this sort of assembly which would escape this straitjacket that we have got ourselves into, we feel that unlike some proposals for an appointed assembly, it is important to have an elected one. If it is appointed by provincial governments or by the federal government, you will have delegates who are beholden to one or both levels of government and we are going to have the same type of problem sorting out the battle between interests. The process of election could certainly be left to the province, however. In Ontario's case, in our brief we outline a proposal for proportional representation within the province.

2040

What would the agenda of such a conference consist of? It would obviously have to deal with the question of language and Quebec's place in Confederation. As Hele indicated, we have some problem with the idea of distinctness for Quebec, but perhaps the best approach in terms of selling it in the rest of Canada would be to define that in terms of language and make it clear that the promotion of French in Quebec is analogous to the promotion of English in other parts of the country as the language in which the business of everyday life is carried out.

Another obvious topic is Senate reform. There is a consensus, I am sure, among everyone who has appeared in front of this committee that we need an elected House and to abolish the current structure.

The Chair: I am going to have to ask you to sum up, sir.

Mr Robson: Perhaps I should not presume to say too much about what a constituent assembly would do; after all, it has to be given a pretty free rein to make its own agenda. It has to address the question of the division of powers of Canada. We have too much overlap. We have

the federal government trying to tell the provinces what to do, the provinces telling municipalities what to do. There is no accountability in the process.

We look at health services and we regard that as an appropriate provincial area. The feds do not have to tell them what to do; the provincial voters will tell them what to do. Medicare started in Saskatchewan. The provinces will know pretty quickly if the voters do not like what they are doing. So we have to rethink the division of powers. We have to rethink the division of taxing power as well, because we feel, and I am sure some with experience in municipal government will agree, that the municipal governments have an enormous impact on quality of life. They have no resources of their own to carry out their responsibilities.

Just to recap a constituent assembly, we would urge the Ontario government to lend its support to such a step. It is a leap of faith, but a leap of faith is what Canada may need right now. History offers many examples of successful reforms through assemblies like this. There is no reason to think Canada could not succeed where others have succeeded. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

VERA WALTON

The Chair: Vera Walton. Following Mrs Walton, I will be calling on E. Peters, D. Francis and J. DeSouza.

Mrs Walton: Good evening. I hope Quebec will stay in Canada. We both have too much to lose by separating. We would lose a vital part of our country and Quebec could lose by being diminished. They would have to start from scratch, build their own banking systems, currency, customs and post office, arrange pensions, and evidently they will not receive any equalization payments.

So much of what is troubling Canada today has its roots in bilingualism. Bilingualism has failed because it has tried to alter the natural behaviour pattern of our country. There was an ancient law that a group cannot change a tradition against its will. The groups can cause disasters often and disturbances, but in the end the natural, underlying characteristic of the nation will prevail, as we have seen in Europe lately.

Language is very important. It is the linchpin of our society and perhaps the most important thing we have. We know Quebec is French. Their preference is for French and French only. They recently brushed aside a Supreme Court ruling about the bilingual signs in Montreal.

The politicians talk of the unity of one Canada. In actual fact there are two nations here and always have been, English and French. Each one of us finds it difficult to function in the other society, and it was hard for us to be forced to learn a second language in order to have certain jobs. Bilingualism is not a unifying force. A great number of us could not learn French, so we were not able to have careers above a certain point in government, civil service, armed forces, Air Canada and some 300 other businesses. Bilingualism has been with us for over 23 years, so has been well tested.

The bedrock character of Ontario is beginning to assert itself. Last year some 40 or so cities and towns declared themselves unilingual English because they just could not

afford to pay any more money for French services. Our then Premier, David Peterson, a popular Premier with a large majority, became a victim of bilingualism after promising to make Ontario officially bilingual. We know how badly he was defeated. It was an Ontario version of a long, hot summer.

Of course there are other things wrong with Canada and for the first time in our history we have lost control of our immigration. In the past, people who wished to come here had to be pre-screened. Now so many can simply come here, hire their lawyers at our expense and stay here for years or for ever. Among the desirable ones, now we get a lot of undesirable people.

Instead of Canada going through separation and tearing ourselves to pieces, fighting a great deal of ill will, could we not stay together as a country but without bilingualism? Let bilingualism go. Let Quebec live completely in French—it will anyway—and let the rest of us live in English or in any language we wish. Give us all a little freedom to be ourselves. Then one day, if we can settle this peaceably and God willing, we can meet one another as fellow countrymen, as Canadians, unhyphenated Canadians. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

DUDLEY FRANCIS

The Chair: I call next E. Peters, D. Francis and J. DeSouza.

Mr Francis: Mr Chairman, I am Dudley Francis, speaking on behalf of my two colleagues Joe DeSouza and Eric Peters. We are immigrants from India and belong to a small community known as the Anglo-Indians, an English-speaking ethnic minority. We came to Canada at various times during the past 30 years, mainly for economic reasons, and we are proud to be citizens of this great country. However, we are deeply saddened to read and hear that the people of Canada, more especially the descendants of the founding nations, seem to an increasing degree no longer to care for the unity of their country. Increasingly they talk glibly of separation and division, of becoming part of our neighbours to the south.

Our native country of India consists of 26 provinces, with people who speak many languages and dialects and have different cultures and religions. Yet despite separatist tendencies and even separatist movements, a central government with strong powers under a single constitution continues to fight for a united country. Our neighbours to the south even fought a civil war to keep the north and south together. Unfortunately, too many of our politicians, business people and even ordinary citizens seem to accept or acquiesce to the possibility of a divided country.

Unity is a close mesh of many factors, economic as well as non-economic, and many of both are being dismantled or destroyed. We submit that the people of Canada are not prepared to allow the breakup of this great country. It is only in recent weeks that the Prime Minister of Canada, after keeping silent for too long, spoke out openly that he would not allow Canada to be dismantled. He promised a restructuring. This was a message which should have been given to the nation from day one when the Meech

Lake accord failed. We, however, insist that this restructuring must not weaken the political fabric of Canada.

Now we come to the nub of our presentation. We reiterate that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Once the Constitution enshrines the role of the provinces in Confederation, it is imperative to consider this historic role in the context of a fast-changing economic and political world. The role of the federal government should not be weakened in the framing and implementing of policies to knit together the various regions of the country into a cohesive and vigorous Canada, ready to meet global competition.

2050

Based on these objectives, we favour minimal changes in the existing division of powers as between federal and provincial. This would not preclude some devolution of subjects by the centre to Quebec to strengthen its cultural and linguistic identity. We support some extension of the Charter of Rights, especially relating to women and native peoples, but consider that the "notwithstanding" clause should be deleted. Reform of the Senate on regional and elected lines is favoured.

However, it seems to us that based on failed negotiations in the recent past, the present amending formula in the Constitution, sections 38 and 42, is too complicated and impractical. The opting-out and unanimity provisions may well prove to be emasculating. We therefore suggest basic amendment of this formula. If this cannot be achieved nor agreement reached on a division of powers, especially by Quebec, we feel that serious consideration should be given to setting up a constituent assembly.

Such an assembly would comprise representatives of all the provinces and territories, native peoples and other ethnic groups, women's groups, business, labour, religion and professionals. This assembly would be instructed to enshrine in the Constitution the fundamental rights of citizens as embodied in the Charter of Rights, to draft the division of powers between federal and the provinces, the role and composition of Parliament and the provincial legislatures, designate the language or languages which would be the official language or languages of the country.

Last but not least, the assembly should enumerate the guiding principles and objectives required to be promoted by the government for the good of all citizens, with broad-based representation and constitutional expertise and not by professional politicians alone. Such an assembly can provide a workable and effective Constitution.

Finally, in the meantime, whichever constitutional route is followed, the federal and other governments must make Quebec interests understand firmly and clearly that they are either in or out. If they decide to stay in, they have to abide by the provisions of the Canadian Constitution and the requirements of the federal government.

If they decide to exit, they may exit only after all federal, legal and monetary obligations are met in full. No form of sovereignty-association is acceptable. Quebec must establish immediately its own central bank, currency, defence, postal services, etc. Quebec must also accept its proportionate share of the national debt. All Québecois federal employee services should be terminated without compensation for unfulfilled future employment.

The Chair: Sir, could you sum up, please.

Mr Francis: Finally, if Quebec is to secede it must be on mutually satisfactory terms. They must pay an equitable price for their choice. They must not be allowed to secede at our expense. However, we are still optimistic enough to believe that Canada will survive and prosper as a whole united country. Long live Canada.

The Chair: Thank you.

FIRST NATIONS STUDENT UNION
OF OSGOODE HALL LAW SCHOOL

The Chair: I invite next the native law students of Osgoode Hall. Following that, I will be calling Rudy Lak.

Mr Christmas: Good evening. My name is Bern Christmas and I am speaking on behalf of the First Nations Student Union of Osgoode Hall Law School. The question we would like to address is: How can we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?

We, the First Nations Student Union of Osgoode Hall Law School, believe that justice for aboriginal peoples will ultimately be achieved the day our rightful place within Confederation is finally recognized. Such recognition will be achieved once Canadians have become aware of the existence of our rights as the first peoples of this land, and once Canadian institutions have been reformed to accord with this reality.

An example of the lack of recognition we experience is contained within this public discussion paper itself. In the discussion of the tradition of diversity on page 7, reference is made to "the existence within one country of two of the world's great languages...multiculturalism," and to the fact that "this diversity had its origins in the first encounter of aboriginal peoples and that this diversity has since been amplified by immigration."

In our view, the fact that we are not referred to among the two great languages, i.e., the two founding peoples, as the reference to first nations as an example of the diversity amplified by immigration, has implicit within it the notion that we are an immigrant group within Canada. We are not an immigrant group. We are the first and founding peoples of Canada.

Sections 25 and 35 of the charter specifically recognize and guarantee our special position within Confederation. Any statement with a potential reference to our peoples as an immigrant group, whether accidental or not, is a failure to recognize our reality. The kind of long-term understanding needed in order for Canadians to recognize first nations as sovereign entities will come only through sustained reform of all Canadian institutions.

Perhaps nowhere is this reform more urgently needed than in the legal system. Our contact with the legal system in the areas of criminal and family law has reached staggering proportions. For example, the most common offence for which both native men and women serve sentences are liquor-related. The higher the native population in a given area in Ontario, the higher the percentage of native admissions to jails.

In the Kenora provincial correctional facility, 95% of jailed women are native. The predominant ages of the native persons jailed are young adults between 21 and 30 years of age.

...e. In comparison to non-Indian young people, Indian youths were two and a half times more likely to be placed on probation, four times more likely to be committed to training school, four times more likely to be admitted to a children's aid facility.

Yet, from our experience, law students at Osgoode Hall are not being trained to deal with this reality. The law schools are usually completely unaware of the problems first nations have with the system because of the low priorities these issues are given in our legal education. Professors refuse to discuss aboriginal rights and constitutional law. Aboriginal title in the law of property is a mere afterthought. The problems we face with the criminal law are never discussed. Yet these same professors-lawyers will play a critical role in the discussion of aboriginal rights. They will sit in judgement on the meaning of the laws, they will advise government ministries, they will sit at the first ministers' constitutional conferences on aboriginal rights.

It is with these observations in mind that we propose at this committee recommend that the government of Ontario issue a directive to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities to immediately address this issue at all levels in order to have a meaningful and practical impact.

We further recommend that an inquiry into legal education be made at Osgoode Hall specifically. We propose at the inquiry be made into curriculum, teaching methods, the lack of aboriginal professors and the establishment of an aboriginal intensive program.

With regard to the specific areas, ie, the curriculum view, law students are not being prepared for the coming changes to Canadian Confederation with the entrenching of aboriginal and treaty rights under sections 25 and 35 of the charter. There is now a recognition of the special constitutional position of first nations within Confederation. The recognition of sovereignty will have major impact on all areas of law. New issues of jurisdiction and native jurisprudence will enter into the discussion. As well, with a recognition of aboriginal title, new challenges to existing concepts of land ownership will arise. This concept is complex and must become a full part of any discussion of property. Problems in the areas of criminal and family law must be pointed out as well to students.

With regard to teaching methods, we should examine how professors are dealing with first nations people. This means we must look into the reasons professors will use hypotheticals where students are asked to think of themselves as colonizers and to consider the most effective way to use the law to oppress indigenous peoples. Racist questions like these should never be asked but recur with disturbing frequency.

In the area of first nations professors, to date there is not one professor of first nations ancestry teaching at Osgoode Hall. It is crucial to the learning of the aboriginal perspective that these students be taught by a first nations professor.

On establishment of an aboriginal intensive program, Osgoode Hall Law School prides itself on being innovative in making legal education relevant to disadvantaged groups in the form of intensive programs that immerse students in the real world of legal practice. An intensive

program in the area of first nations should be a priority, especially in light of other equality initiatives under way at the institution. The first nations community as a whole should have input in this process. Many local and national organizations would receive direct and immediate benefits from an intensive program.

The Chair: Sir, would you sum up, please.

Mr Christmas: As well, they would make legal education relevant to the first nations students. The above we respectfully submit.

The Chair: Thank you.

2100

RUDY LAK

The Chair: I invite next Rudy Lak, and following Mr Lak, Martin Jaeger.

Mr Lak: Mr Chair, MPPs and the select committee, it is an honour for me to be here tonight to present my views. I have a couple of things I would like to talk about in terms of Canada and its citizenry. I would like to touch on some things I have been thinking about myself. First of all, I have some concerns about where we are going as a country, and I think the people of Canada need to have an opportunity to express themselves.

My name is Rudy Lak, and I am a deaf person. I am a leader in the community, and I have been involved heavily with the sports associations of the deaf here in Ontario. Presently, of course, there is the world winter games of the deaf being held in Banff, Alberta, and the opening is very soon. We are going to be opening that; we have candles. I just wanted to announce that. We have various countries coming to Canada with deaf representatives. We have skiing and a variety of things. It would have been nice for me to be there, but I could not go. Anyway, here I am presenting before you today.

Some of my concerns I would like to talk about have to do with people who come to Canada and speak English as a second language. It is a real concern to me. As I meet people, whether they be Italian or whatever background, I recognize the difficulty they face as parents. For example, my family is from Lithuania, so my family had English as a second language. I come from that experience, so I have seen their frustration as well as the frustration of other people who have had to come to Canada and face the barrier of language.

I know that in Quebec, French is the second language, but when you sometimes go to a variety store or various other places in your neighbourhood, you often will see shopkeepers who may be from Korea or various other places. We communicate with a lot of gestures and we do not have any problems communicating. Often we will write notes back and forth. We both face that similar kind of frustration when it comes to communication, but I think it is something we need to recognize. It is something that certainly has caught my attention when you look at the kinds of things that happen.

For example, you can see in Korea airline pilots who speak many languages, and then they come to Canada and are told they have not got the qualifications or they cannot

do this or they cannot do that, and they use English or they use language as a barrier. They say "Canadian experience." But I think if you look at the people themselves and give them an opportunity to improve their English, people can participate.

I think we need to allow the public to learn more. In our community, for example, we have 15 people who can teach sign language, and often they apply for jobs in the public schools to teach some of their language and get turned down. This is an example from our community. We have the technology and the ability to improve access for people, not just for deaf people but for anyone who comes from a minority where English is a second language. It is an untapped resource. You need to be able to have things available.

For example, on TV you can have captioning or little words across the bottom of the screen, but when you are talking about going to other parts of the province where maybe they speak another language, where you have a small population, there are still ways to get around that. When people come together, I think we can find ways to improve services, for example, offering courses or other kinds of ways so that people who want to move from Quebec to, let's say, Markham or other parts of the country can interact. I think we could do that through technology, if we had surveys or something where we could count how many people want or require the service. I think that is something the government needs to look at, and take a look at providing courses and get people out to register for these things. Whether you are Italian or whatever, I think you need to be able to develop the kind of resources for those people so they can participate.

There is a wealth of resources out there. A lot of people come to this country from many different places, and of course immigration is increasing. We need that. But people when they get here are told that English may be a problem for them. They may come from Asia, they may come from Europe, wherever, but the point is that we need to be able to improve resources in order for them to maximize their potential. This is something similar to what deaf people face.

As well, I would like to talk a little about the cultures in Canada. Of course, Canada is not just one culture. There are many.

Another point that really disturbs me now is the role of Canada in the world. Canada is a beautiful country. We are one of the largest countries in the world. We have lots of food. Our environment is wonderful, although it needs to be cleaned up. We have lots of cultures out there. The world as a global village is getting smaller, and I think the world looks to Canada for leadership. If you look at the size of the Soviet Union and you look at the size of other countries, if you look at what happens in Japan, for example, or other places, I think they have some things we could learn from. Still, people look to us for leadership. We are one of the members of the seven, the economic powers that run the show, and we need not to spoil that.

In regard to the defence of Canada, it has disturbed me that our navy and our armed forces have been left to deteriorate and that we have not kept up our commitments.

Prior to this Persian Gulf crisis, I do not think our armed forces received very much. We still had a lot of old Second World War machinery in operation, and I do not think this is something that befitted our country. As a committee—

The Chair: Sir, I am going to ask you to sum up.

Mr Lak: Okay, I will wrap up quickly. If you look at the role of Canada, it is embarrassing that some of our institutions have been left to fall lax. If you look at 1975, before, when some of the other governments were happening and before the Persian Gulf crisis, we used to have great pride in our institutions, and I think this has deteriorated. I think people are now applauding because we are finally doing something, but we have some embarrassing marks on our record; for example, Oka and some of the other things that have happened in the recent past. I do not think we have the credibility we once had. We need to take a look at our country and make it a place we are proud of and make it a country where we do not say: "Well, it's your problem. It's not my problem."

I guess that is all I wanted to say. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you. I hope you understood my points.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

MARTIN JAEGER

The Chair: I call next Martin Jaeger, and following Mr Jaeger, Kirk MacGregor.

Mr Jaeger: Mr Chairman, good evening. I have a short talk of about four minutes, so if there are any questions you will have time.

I am here to discuss section 93 of our Constitution. It is a carryover from the British North America Act and it is written in archaic language. In simple terms, section 93 provides that in Ontario and Quebec respectively, the state will fund Roman Catholic and Protestant parochial education. I am delighted that the RCs and the Protestants were able to work out a deal that kept them from each other's throats; it still gives me pleasure that they were able to do that. But the deal had its unsatisfactory aspect in that it made no provision for giving other groups like treatment. Specifically, the deal had no provision to fund schools oriented to native religion, it had no provision to fund schools oriented to other religions practised in Canada and it had no provision to phase out the privilege granted to RC and Protestant parochial education.

We are here discussing how the Constitution can be improved. One way is clear. Eliminate this provision for preferential treatment based on religion. Let the government of this province treat people of all religions the same.

Our politicians have served us very badly on this issue. Over the past few years they should have been sensitizing Ontarians to the need for change. Instead, last year Mr Rae, reasoning more badly than a turnip, appeared on TV Ontario to assert that funding RC education in Ontario was a good thing and that similar funding for other groups would be a bad thing. During the last Ontario electoral campaign, Mr Peterson studiously avoided the issue and Mr Harris would only state that dealing with the question was not a priority.

10

The discussion paper at hand does not concern itself with Quebec or the division of responsibilities between the federal and provincial governments. I refer, of course, to this paper put out under the hand of Mr Rae. The discussion paper, page 7, points out that the Constitution prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability, ethnic origin, race, colour or gender. But religion is not on this list of prohibited discriminations mentioned in the document because the Constitution itself sanctions discrimination on the basis of religion, and Ontario chooses not to mitigate the effect by extending the privilege granted to its education in this province.

How can this province, how can you as a group of legislators, insist that the people of Ontario not discriminate when the very Constitution of the country sanctions discrimination on the basis of religion and Ontario legislators refuse to do anything about it?

By the way, if the discussion paper can pat Canadians in the back for having prohibited certain forms of discrimination, why cannot the document display intellectual honesty by recognizing that we still have a problem with respect to discrimination based on religion?

Why is the government of Ontario concerning itself with the constitutional problems of the country at large when it will not even recognize, let alone deal with, the constitutional problem of the province?

Mr Chairman, we have begun badly with a discussion paper that distorts by omission. You members of the committee have the responsibility and the power to be more intellectually honest than the document at hand, than was Mr Rae. Do it. Section 93 has to go, and your report is a good place to start the task.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. We will proceed with the next speaker in that we are behind time.

KIRK MacGREGOR

The Chair: Kirk MacGregor, and following Mr MacGregor, Robert Arnone.

Mr MacGregor: Going along with the title of the discussion paper, I shall go straight from the heart about what would regard as changing for the better. What I would like to see in Canada is two trends. One is towards a unified country that really feels like a country, where everyone is coming to regard themselves as Canadians far and away first, and anything else third or sixth. I do not consider myself an Ontarian or a Scottish Canadian or any such thing. I consider myself a Canadian. I would like to see all levels of government in Canada and related things like constitutions working towards a unified Canadianness.

The other thing I would like to see is a move in the direction of citizenship for all. I do not mean the whole world, but that all Canadian citizens be treated equally in law and custom with no special privileges for any certain groups.

In moving towards these two objectives, the thing that would strike me as being desirable is modification of the Constitution to remove features that prevent this. One obvious example is the numerous references to French and English in the Bill of Rights. There is a natural tendency

for people in one country to evolve towards speaking a single language, and the Constitution should not prevent this.

As for the people who feel they exist to serve a language or a culture, I can only say that I think languages and cultures exist to serve people, and as a descendant of various people who did not speak English until a few centuries ago, maybe even more recently than that, some of whom were brutally crushed by the English, notably some of my father's ancestors, all I can say is that acquiring a Canadian identity is ample recompense for losing whatever past identities existed in the Scottish Highlands and elsewhere that my ancestors came from.

It is not possible to create something new without something old disappearing to make way for it, and life is an endless cycle of this sort of thing, as all cultures and nations change. I think we should embrace change in the direction of becoming more unified.

There are, of course, two significant groups that are trying to push in opposite directions. One of these is Quebec. I would rather see them go their way and do what is important to them so that the rest of us can get together as a unified country. Perhaps the best approach is to create a government of English Canada and negotiate some sort of sovereignty-association with Quebec and with the national government over that. One thing I have always regretted is that English Canada splintered and cannot speak with a united voice.

The second major dissenting group is the aboriginal peoples. I guess one position they to some extent take could be summed up by saying that because all of my ancestors were at one point conquered by Rome, I and my descendants should for ever after receive special favours from Italian Canadians because of that. All I have to say is that I am opposed to perpetual special favours for any group in Canada. Local government, clarification of land title, changing of Canadian law to incorporate good ideas from Indian customs and spending however many billions of dollars it takes, all of these I am in favour of, but special status for any racial group I am opposed to.

That about sums it up. I would like to see Canada get away from the divisions that have plagued it for all its existence and start evolving towards being fully a country.

ROBERT ARNONE

The Chair: Robert Arnone, and following Mr Arnone, Patricia Semach.

Mr Arnone: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I hope to be brief in order to field a question or two at the end. Rather than detail my concerns on the constitutional crisis in this country, I will attempt a brief summary of them, as well as review events leading up to the present situation as I see them.

First, it is important to note that my generation of Canadians has not known a Canada without a Quebec issue. That is, from the FLQ through the Parti québécois and subsequent referendum, and now the failed Meech Lake accord and resultant Allaire report, I have witnessed varying degrees of Quebec discontent.

I think it is safe to say that at times during Lévesque's separatist government we all felt that the nation's fate was

questionable and unstable. But almost as quickly as that threat appeared, it was neutralized with a no vote in the 1980 referendum. I think that at that very vulnerable point in Canada's history, Canadians everywhere breathed a collective sigh of relief.

Pierre Trudeau feeling that the timing was right and, truthfully, aware of the twilight setting on his political career, attempted the very noble task of bringing Canada's Constitution home. Failing to draw Quebec in, he was confident that, with the eventual demise of the separatist movement, Quebec would join the rest of the nation and enter into a new Constitution.

Trudeau, however, had not considered the possibility that a less experienced and, some will argue, a less competent leader would pick up where he left off. Unfortunately for Canada, that was the case, and today we all agree that the process towards the Meech Lake accord was flawed and the leadership necessary to see it through was not evident. Now we are at another impasse, another period of vulnerability and instability where Canada's future is in jeopardy.

But what separates this current period of Quebec turbulence from others, and has certainly created a more desperate atmosphere among those who consider it essential to keep this nation intact, are three main points.

2120

First, the current economic situation is allowing few the optimism necessary to see this crisis through, and is threatening many with poor judgement, haste and irrationality. Second is the absence of a strong federal leadership, which is the essential ingredient for a unified and determined federalism, a federalism that puts Canada first above all else, a federalism that does not walk away from legitimate native issues and can firmly and fairly deal with the problems and concerns of all provinces. The final point is the Allaire report itself, which has reintroduced and reinforced the unsettling implications of Quebec sovereignty and has in effect offered little more than an inflexible ultimatum to the rest of this nation.

As such, this committee, as I see it, has no option but to lend its recommendation to a stronger federal commitment towards a unified nation, and it must therefore reject this document. I am confident that improved economic conditions and improved federal leadership will see us through this impasse. Of course, there is always room for fair and equitable negotiations between the federal and provincial governments and between the provinces themselves, but there should be little tolerance for ultimatums and minimum demands, especially when the future of Canada is at stake.

It is time Canada started building on its constitutional foundations. The problems inherent in distinct cultural preservation and national unification are ongoing and certainly negotiable, given proper judgement and diplomacy, but they are not to be negotiated with inflexible deadlines and ultimatums. I just want to say this: I appreciate and encourage the creation of this committee and others like it and I truly wish you the best of luck.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. We will just carry on.

PATRICIA SEMACH

The Chair: Patricia Semach; following Ms Sumach Pierre Blevant.

Ms Semach: First of all, I would like to give you little personal background. I am a new Canadian. My family immigrated to Canada from Hungary and Czechoslovakia on my mother's and father's side of the family respectively. When my father reached Canada's shores, he was fluent in five languages, none of them being French or English, yet he has grown to love his adopted country despite language and cultural barriers. My family is a small part which makes up the Canadian mosaic.

I discovered, while reading a passage in the Bible, that it paralleled the description of the Canadian family. It goes as follows:

"Now the body is not made up of one part but of many. If the foot should say, 'Because I am not the hand, I do not belong to the body,' it would not for that reason cease to be part of the body. And if the ear should say, 'Because I am not an eye, I do not belong to the body,' it would not for that reason cease to be part of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where would the sense of hearing be? If the whole body were an ear, where would the sense of smelling be?"

This can be likened to the Canadian family in that each region of Canada is diverse from each other, but our diversity should act as our strength if we recognize the potential for our differences complementing each other to work together for the common good of the Canadian federation. The passage continues:

"But God has combined the members of the body and has given greater honour to the parts that lacked it, so that there should be no division in the body, but that its parts should have equal concern to each other. If one part suffers, every part suffers with it. If one part is honoured, every part rejoices with it."

These last few verses have been personified in Confederation. Prince Edward Island is the least of the Canadian provinces with regard to its population and geographic size, but it is great in that its capital served as the birthplace of Confederation. The native communities of Canada comprise 1.3% of the total population, but this small community represented by one man, Elijah Harper, stopped the passage of the Meech Lake accord because he felt that the grievances of his people were not addressed in that constitutional reform package. Clearly we can see that Canada as a whole is dependent upon smaller communities with itself for its wellbeing. We should never look at each other in terms of sheer numbers. Mutual love and respect foster understanding between any people. These qualities should be utilized in any further negotiations with each other.

As far as the federal government goes, the present Conservative government has shown itself to be incompetent and untrustworthy in dealing with Canadian issues. The Conservative policies of dismembering and eroding our national institutions, which all Canadians cherish, illustrates this point well. Also, Michael Wilson's latest budget threatens our national standards in health and social programs. Therefore, Ontario, as the strongest province, must assume the leadership role in future constitution negotiations.

Canada is full of symbolism. There is a bronze statue of Samuel de Champlain in Couchiching Beach Park at Brillia heralding him as the father of Canada. Ironically, Brillia is also the site where this committee met fierce opposition to one of Canada's national symbols, bilingualism. I believe this is another area where Ontario can and must take a leadership role. I am pleased to say that this government and the previous one have made great progress in assuring the equality of our two official languages. I believe that the dualism which now exists has polarized and divided us. Bilingualism means you can speak to the other and share a sense of belonging. The Ontario government should be promoting and recognizing the merits of bilingualism to the Ontario community and to Canada as a whole.

Economically, Ontario should encourage and restore former east-west relationships. To that end, I believe trade barriers between provinces should be removed. Unfortunately, the present federal government has taken the position to weaken the Canadian Confederation by promoting stronger north-south links. I believe Ontario can strengthen its position in the Canadian economy by strengthening and expanding the joint Ontario-Quebec marketing initiative focused on promotion in Europe.

The Chair: If you could sum up, madam, please.

Ms Semach: Okay, I am just closing. This would lessen our economic dependence on one market economy, namely, the United States.

In closing, I would like to mention the title I gave to this brief, *The Canadians Who Wouldn't Be*, for the reason that some Canadians reject our national symbols, such as multiculturalism and bilingualism. These two facets of Canadian culture are the backbone of our society. Pierre Trudeau said it best when he said:

"The success of our efforts in the first century following Confederation was promising, but by no means complete. We created a society of individual liberty and of respect for human rights.... Thus, from generation to generation there has been handed down the belief that a country could be built in freedom and equality with two languages with a multitude of cultures. I am confident it can be done."

I too am confident it can be done if only we recognize Canada's full potential and we as a people strive towards that excellence through co-operation, mutual love and respect of one member of the Canadian body for the other. Thank you very much.

PIERRE BLEVALANT

The Chair: I call Pierre Blevallant; following Mr Blevallant, Richard Comber.

Mr Blevallant: Mr Chairman, committee members, some 35 years ago I had to make a momentous choice. It was whether to follow an emotional tug which would place my family in Montreal for the foreseeable future or make a businesslike decision to settle in Toronto. Despite being a young idealist, pragmatism triumphed and we adopted Toronto as our home. Being Canadian by choice rather than by birth has made us extremely appreciative of the history, culture, tradition and potential of this country,

but it also causes us to despair of the current directions in which Canada is being taken by our government.

Having been in international trade for several years prior to arriving in Toronto, I had been used to the European practice of that time: You wrote in your own language and received the reply in the respondent's own language. Paris to London was in French, Oslo to Milan was in Norwegian, Hamburg to Madrid was in German and so on. If there was a chance of difficulty in accuracy through the translation process, then English would be used, especially as this was in engineering and precision was vital. Gradually, as the trade moved beyond the continent and Asian tongues were encountered more frequently, English filled the need for a common language. Nowhere did that mean that a native language was lost, nor did it cause the abandonment of a culture.

It has, therefore, been somewhat amusing to watch the frantic antics of many Canadians pandering to the demands of one segment of its population. Not so amusing was the senior citizen's experience when, having written a federal ministry, he received a curt demand from that ministry's Trois Rivières office to write "en français."

2130

Ironically, in preparation for the 1991 European transition into greater unity, France has now made English mandatory throughout its school system. No, it is not bilingualism, just a means of ensuring that citizens of future generations will be prepared to meet the demands of supranational and international realities. Maybe the paranoia of the de Gaulle years, when Americanization of the language was so traumatic, has been overcome.

I also find great irony in Canada's pursuit of "unity through diversity." This cornerstone of our multicultural policies is an oxymoron that should be thrown out in the same way that our European cousins are having to cast off the barriers of overblown state egos. It is not a painless task—you can ask Margaret Thatcher about that—but multinational interdependence demands that we remove all artificial barriers.

The gathering of free trade zones has involved Canada twice in recent years, yet we still cannot claim to have free trade within our national boundaries. How long are we going to keep adding to our self-destructive mechanisms? I refer to interprovincial trade, bilingualism, multiculturalism, patronage and unbridled political control.

During the Meech Lake debacle, in which we saw the ultimate downfall of an elitist group's stranglehold on power, some glimmer of hope was kindled. There was a realization of the need for the general populace to be involved and a belated understanding that Canadians wanted input into the decision-making process, especially in matters affecting their own governance. We saw the Charest commission, Ontario's select committee 1990 hearings, followed now by so many others, including this committee. Unfortunately, too many of these processes are manipulated by the people who are to summarize opinions and draw conclusions or by their staff, as well as by any highly organized special-interest group.

Despite the flaws, a clear message should filter through to any discerning person. It is most vital that this message

be recognized. Canadians not only want to be heard; they now insist on being fully involved in the process. Most of us no longer trust our politicians. We now seek to achieve a true democracy, not the representative democracy which then begat executive democracy, another Canadian oxymoron.

It is high time we eliminated the first ministers concept and instituted a constituent assembly to examine constitutional changes to permit Canada to enter the 21st century in a revitalized sense of unity and pride. The recommendations of that body would require ratification by the Canadian people to become enacted. One prime concept we need to reintroduce into our governments and elected or appointed officials is responsibility, with its cohort accountability. This would then need some mechanisms such as member recall, impeachment, referenda and constant citizen input.

You have heard praises of the German and Japanese constitutions. While some have extolled the trilingual Swiss success, others espouse the melting pot of the United States of America, while France's basic principles have been lauded. I do not hesitate to recommend that we beg, borrow or steal the better elements from all of those, but I sincerely hope the operative words in any new Canadian approach will be, "We, the people."

RICHARD COMBER

The Chair: Mr Comber; following Mr Comber, Robert Mortimer.

Mr Comber: I want to congratulate the committee, Mr Chair, particularly on your durability over the last four weeks. I imagine this has been a very tiring, though I hope somewhat rewarding, experience for you all. Your work is of the greatest import. I wish I could give you all the answers you have been looking for in the five minutes I have. I cannot do that, but here are some thoughts to assist your work, I hope.

Canada as we know it has failed. A last desperate attempt to shoehorn Quebec into a structure that deals with all of Canada's component provinces as essentially equal and similar organisms ended in ignominy last June. Quebec rapidly thereafter made it clear that unless Canada was prepared to become a loose union between a largely sovereign Quebec and one or more other, presumably Anglo-Canadian, components, Quebec was prepared to move swiftly to full independence while leaving the door ajar to permit the early negotiation of some sort of special arrangement between an independent Quebec and Canada.

Powerful group after powerful group in Quebec have supported one version or another of this vision of the future. The waning minority opposing it principally represents minorities itself and those with special interests in maintaining a more traditional Canada. Opinion surveys in Quebec consistently show support for sovereignty-association nearing two thirds, with over three quarters of francophones voting with the majority. In all likelihood, Québécois will opt for sovereignty-association in a referendum to be held some time between mid-1992 and mid-1993 with full sovereignty to come into effect no later than 24 June 1994.

Before that time, another federal election will have been held, and Canadians outside of Quebec will have had

a new opportunity to express themselves as to who they wish to negotiate with Quebec on their behalf. Regardless of how well various provinces and other participants may play their hands, it is likely that the central authority in Ottawa will co-ordinate and spearhead the Canadian side in any negotiations with a sovereign Quebec.

Quite apart from such negotiations and our concern with the matter of Quebec, whether we remain in some form of association or federation with Quebec or not, it is essential that we immediately begin to restructure English Canada so that it will work effectively politically, economically, socially, culturally and internationally. A number of additional problems must be addressed:

1. In a Canada without Quebec, or merely loosely associated with Quebec, Ontario is much too large and dominant to permit a federation to successfully function. Ontario, as now structured, cannot permit itself to be part of a parliamentary structure where its voice would be identical to that of every one of eight to 12 other members of the federation. Ontario has almost half of the population of what would be the new Canada and cannot be content with 10% or less of the political power. This necessarily means that a triple E Senate and other similar formulae for reform would not work unless the other components of the new Canadian federation coalesced into two or at most three other components, what you might call megaprovinces, or unless Ontario was broken up into four or five new components, what you might call micropvinces. I sense that Ontario is becoming ever more difficult to govern effectively and ever more regionally disparate itself, and would therefore prefer the latter option.

2. Another essential factor in restructuring Canada is to fully accommodate the aboriginal peoples in any new constitutional arrangement. The Ontario government and others have talked of extending municipal status to reserve; but this is reminiscent of using Band-Aids on a haemorrhage. Nothing short of providing for full and equal status for Canada's aboriginal peoples, through the establishment of one or more geographically non-contiguous provinces, can be expected to provide a long-term solution. The alternative of providing an insufficient answer and watchin reserves or groups of reserves follow Quebec's route to independence would be tragic and catastrophic.

2140

The Chair: Mr Comber, would you sum up, please.

Mr Comber: I am at the end of my time? Well, I will just let you people read the third and fourth sections there and thank you very much for hearing me. I appreciate the constraints you are under for time, and I hope that what have said will be of some small use to you. Good luck.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ROBERT MORTIMER

The Chair: Robert Mortimer; following Mr Mortimer, I will be calling Albert Tuelch.

Mr Mortimer: Ladies and gentlemen, members of the select committee, Mr Chairman, the country is in a trouble time, but where does Ontario stand? We all have our views on this matter, but unfortunately many commen

which erupt at stress-filled times have an edge of intolerance. Something should be done to quell these bigoted views, which in actuality do not reflect those of the silent majority of Ontario. Instead, the vocal minority gets most of the attention. I am here today to give you a sample of the other side.

I stand before you a unilingual anglophone. I am not affiliated with any group, organization or political thought. I am here on my own, an ordinary English Ontarian, to state that this province should become officially bilingual. I have come to this conclusion for many reasons, not the least of which is to portray a leading example of tolerance and understanding towards Quebec during this constitutional crisis.

Our country is on the brink of destruction, and history may never forgive us if we allow it to happen. But if worse comes to worst, I hope we will not abandon Ontario's 40,000 francophones. We must ensure that our French population does not come under siege. Ontario's francophones must not be punished because of the breakup of this country.

I remind you of the very words of Premier Rae, who, when he made this statement four years ago, was the official leader of the Opposition in Ontario's Legislature: "Ontario can do an immense amount for national unity by taking that next step...a step that would include and recognize French as an official language in this province, and one that would guarantee those rights in the Constitution."

Becoming officially bilingual would be a great gesture towards easing the language tensions of this country, much like the stance this commission took by holding its Sault Ste Marie hearings in French and English in the very chambers where the city council voted to become officially bilingual. Sault Ste Marie, a city with French roots, dealt a major blow to the linguistic balance of this nation in January of last year, a day that will live in infamy among francophones nationwide. By becoming officially bilingual, Ontario would be seen as a leader in quelling the intolerance symbolized by that motion.

Canadians, as a whole, should stop concentrating on topics that divide us, and take a more positive approach. Statements like, "Let 'em go," and "Good riddance," in referring to the possible separation of Quebec from the rest of Canada, are not constructive. Also, and I blame the media for this, the constant referring to Quebec as French Canada and the rest of the country as English Canada does nothing to help Canadians truly understand their country.

In my mind, the key to a better understanding of each other is education. I am a product of Ontario's educational system, one in which French-language classes are mandatory up to a certain level. After years of French in my school curriculum, I unfortunately cannot speak the language. Improving the quality of French education in Ontario's French schools should be top priority. Also, every child in this province should have the right to French immersion schooling.

On the other hand, French education for Ontario's francophones should be strengthened. Ontario's first French college, la Cité collégiale, has just opened its doors. We must not stop there. Ontario needs a French university. Bilingual

universities do not adequately do the job. If we give every child the opportunity to study in French, as well as free official languages training to any and all adults, I believe the intolerance we see today will greatly lessen.

On the subject of our founding people, Canada's natives, I wish to see a proper addressing of all wrongs done to them in the past. We have recently mended wounds with some cultural groups interned in the world wars, yet natives were once again overlooked. How long can they possibly continue to be ignored? Outstanding land claims must be addressed and I feel natives should be granted the right to some sort of self-government. It is time we swallowed our pride and did what is just, thereby closing this dark chapter in Canadian history once and for all.

In conclusion, granting Ontario official bilingual status will not harm anyone. It will not affect municipalities in any way. What it will prove to be is a gesture of great importance, an action that will be of great influence and value in the days to come. It will enable Ontario to have a leadership role in future constitutional talks. A bilingual Ontario would be a role model for the rest of the country, and, God knows, that is what this country needs today.

ALBERT TUCHEL

The Chair: Albert Tichel.

Mr Tichel: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, the abundant facts, the figures and opinions practically preclude the option of saying anything new on the issue of constitutional matters. Notwithstanding the reality, the duty of a citizen is to try. The basic essence of constitutional debate is to fathom the soul of the nation, to define and articulate the will of the people.

It does appear to this observer that our national Rubicon has been crossed with Meech Lake. Much of constitutional discourse has centred on the question: What does Quebec want? It is the wrong question. The proper question is: What do the proponents of independence in Quebec want and why are they making such rapid progress? They want "liberté, fraternité, égalité." That is right. The ideals that powered the French Revolution are not dead, and they are raising their head in Quebec.

Exactly what do these Canadians want? The first priority is a massive infusion of intelligence into the corridors of power. They labour under no illusions. In order to further their linguistic, cultural and economic prosperity, they need political, economic and financial power.

Basic questions without preconditions—no sacred cows—belong on the table and demand answers. For instance, do people exist to serve the state or does the state exist to serve the people? A similar definition applies to governments and corporations. A simplistic transfer of power from federal to provincial jurisdiction does not do justice to the issues involved. Only a radical redirection towards what ends governmental power is used will suffice.

Independence-seeking Quebecers reject government by some people, for some people, against the rest of the people. Resolutely they seek to embrace the original version of the above quotation. The obsolete classes have difficulty understanding this, or perhaps they do not want to come to terms with this reality.

What then is expected of governments? A resolute devotion to economic justice to curtail the spiral of criminality; persuasive action to get the custodians of public wealth to exercise their obligations with prudence and compassion; resist and correct the division of society into upper and lower tiers; acknowledge that the maintenance of the exploitative aspects of society requires excessive bureaucracy.

2150

Profit is important. So is the prophet, even if it happens to be the frogs who, by their mass disappearance, tell us they cannot cope with the chemical attack unleashed by us. Excessive land and resource ownership concentration divides the populace neatly into puppets of those who own and wards of the state who are unable to do things for themselves. Curtail the waste of intellectual capital, man-hours and matériel towards destructive ends. Abolish the economic travesty of capitalizing the commercial value of land on an annual basis. Devise a mechanism that will be effective to keep profits generated locally at home. No nation remains healthy for long without this vital lifeblood.

A reordering of priorities, from job creation, with its destructive connotation, towards a more creative goal of market creation, is required; courage to deal with the cause of inflation instead of fighting only the symptoms with interest rates and tight money. What is needed is to show real political leadership without the substitution of fiscal manipulation in its place.

These are some of the issues, by no means all, that have to be considered openly, with honesty, if our national fibre is to grow increasingly stronger. These are not just concerns of Quebecers. They are concerns of Canadians from coast to coast. Indeed, they are global concerns. *Vive Canada libre.*

JASPER KUJAVSKY

The Chair: I call next Jasper Kujavsky; following that, Frank Naccarato.

Mr Kujavsky: Mr Chairman, as I look around this room and I consider all the questions that you have considered, I think that after all the commissions have answered and all the editorial writers have written their columns and all the citizens have spoken and all the pundits have given their opinions, the fundamental question that Canadians will have to face will be decided on one day, one day in Quebec.

Un jour, dans la province de Québec, ce seront les Québécois qui vont faire et prendre leurs décisions sur leur avenir eux-mêmes. Je respecte leur droit de prendre cette décision mais ce ne sera pas comme c'était en 1980 avec une décision sur une question compliquée, un mandat à négocier, la souveraineté-association avec un autre référendum. Cette fois, ce sera sur une question claire : voulez-vous établir un État souverain ?

Do you want to create an independent Quebec? Quebecers will decide that. I think the most important thing this committee can do in Ontario is make very clear to the people of Quebec and to lead the debate in the rest of Canada as to what the answer should be to the question Quebec has fairly laid down to us: What does Canada want? We have always asked: What does Quebec want? They fairly ask and they lay down the gauntlet: What do you want? Let's answer them.

We have seen many options. I have heard in front of the committee four in particular. Perhaps we will see an independent Quebec and the rest of Canada disintegrate, even into the American orbit. Perhaps we will see the "community of Canadas" approach, or even the Allaire report, independent regions or provinces in all but name. Then there are the two options which include a unified Canada where, yes, we complain and we have our problems in this country, but we are members of a family and we will sit down, we will argue about it, we will come up with a resolution; or Quebec will take the decision to become independent, and then we will have to deal with that situation.

Sovereignty means sovereignty. It means control of your borders, control of your politics, control of your economics, control of your culture, control of your defence and foreign policy. We respect the right of Quebec to take that decision. Why would it want us to do anything else but treat it like a sovereign country, a sovereign state? When they have weighed all the options, I hope they say no, but let them know Ontario's response. This is the biggest province in Canada, the economic heartland of Canada. Given the fact that each one of you will sit in the Legislature at the time, I presume, that Quebec takes its decision, I hope each one of you will take the position that you will fight for a united Canada with or without Quebec that if Quebec stays, we will figure out what has to be done, but if Quebec goes, then Ontario's preoccupation and priority will be the keeping together of a united Canada from sea to sea. We will remain an Atlantic country, a Pacific country and an Arctic country; we will be nine provinces plus, I hope, new provinces in the north as we finally figure out how to take care of our northern population and our aboriginal peoples. Quebec should recognize that it can be in or it can be out, but Ontario will take the position that a united Canada will still be our goal.

Let us recognize that we should do all we can do to fulfil what Laurier said was our destiny. But if that is not to be the case, and Quebecers are to make the decision after a crystallization and a focusing of the issues upon which they will take that choice, if they go for independence, then they know the priority of the rest of Canada will be that we become all we can be in recognition of the fact that we will never be all that we could have been.

I hope that is what this committee will take from the process, will make a strong argument for Canada and will do all it can to make sure that when the referendum campaign comes, the historians will not write in answer to the question, "What does Canada want?" that we sat silent, that we answered that question, that the answer is plain and clearly and that Quebecers make their own independent choice on the basis of clear options and clear consideration of the issues.

FRANK NACCARATO

The Chair: Frank Naccarato; following Mr Naccarato, Tadeus Lipinski.

Mr Naccarato: Good evening, Mr Chairman and members of the committee. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak tonight. In our relatively short history, Canada has become one of the world's most prosperous

societies. Canadians enjoy an enviable standard of living, our economy is counted among the top handful in the world, and we are a worthy player in world affairs. Furthermore, the progressive and democratic principles at the core of our society continue to draw hundreds of thousands of immigrants to our shores each year. For these reasons, I believe the essential concepts of Confederation have been successful.

The painful events of 1990, however, have shown that changes are clearly in order. I am convinced the delegates at the Charlottetown conference always intended for Confederation to be flexible and responsive. With this in mind, I think the needs of Quebec, the Atlantic and western regions and native Canadians should be accommodated within a restructured Canada.

In this vein I would like to address four areas of concern: the role of the federal government, Quebec in Confederation, regional representation and, finally, aboriginal peoples in Canada.

The role of the federal government: When this debate is finally resolved, we all expect a new Canada in which power has been disseminated to the provinces or regions. It must be made clear, however, that any arrangement resulting in an ineffective, schizophrenic government in Ottawa is unacceptable. Furthermore, the Canadian social contract must be respected. No province should expect to be enriched by Confederation while refusing to participate in it. For these reasons, all forms of sovereignty-association should be rejected.

For the purposes of decentralization, I suggest the following guidelines to determine the role of the federal government: First, Canada must have a single, unified voice in the international community, especially in the areas of foreign policy, defence, trade and commerce. Domestically, the federal government must have undisputed authority in such national institutions as the Bank of Canada, the post office, criminal justice, unemployment insurance, administration of chartered banks and equalization, as well as many others.

I also contend that there must exist a body of fundamental rights and freedoms that apply everywhere in Canada, without exception. This implies no "notwithstanding" clause. The government of Canada should also be empowered to set national goals and initiatives, as in high technology, research and development, commerce and social programs. Finally, the government of Canada should retain the power to set national standards in some provincial jurisdictions, such as health and education.

2200

Moving on to Quebec in Confederation: In my opinion, the Meech Lake accord failed because the reasonable viewpoints of Canadians were totally bypassed in the debate in favour of politicians with their own agendas. The air became so poisoned with rhetoric and intolerance that it became impossible for one side to appreciate the other's position. In Quebec, any concession became a humiliation. In English Canada, people felt threatened by a so-called French domination. The result is that English Canada still fails to understand that the French culture in Quebec is threatened by the surrounding sea of English in North

America and by immigrants who choose English over French in their host province. Conversely, Quebec continues to be impervious to suggestions that it cannot in good conscience use the argument that Confederation does not work for Quebec when it continues to receive more and more federal plums.

Both viewpoints have validity. In the spirit of finding a workable solution, I would propose the following: First, constitutional recognition of Quebec's distinct society; however, within the context of certain fundamental and universal rights. During the Meech debate, Quebec's distinctiveness was never questioned; rather, it was the refusal to clarify how the distinct society impacted on the Charter of Rights that contributed to Meech's demise. There should also be a transfer of linguistic and cultural jurisdictions to the provinces except those that are of clearly national interest, such as the CRTC and national museums. It only makes sense to move such powers closer to the people. Last, there should be an effort to minimize administrative overlap between federal and provincial governments. This would not only improve federal-provincial relationships but would minimize wasteful federal spending.

With regard to regional representation: To improve the democratic representation of the regions in the federal scheme of government, I would make the following recommendations: There should be a guarantee of regional input to national economic policy, perhaps through constitutional entrenchment. This would give the regions the voice they desire in important policy while maintaining the federal authority. Second, I would transform the Senate into a House of Regions that will represent the west, Ontario, Quebec and the Atlantic region equally. This House will have limited jurisdiction to make laws independently of the House of Commons that affect some interregional concerns. Finally, I would make Supreme Court appointments subject to approval by the new House of Regions.

With regard to the aboriginal peoples in Canada: In our efforts to reconstruct Canada we cannot ignore the fundamental issue of aboriginal rights. To this end I would like to propose the following changes that would result in greater justice and self-determination for native Canadians:

First, constitutional recognition of Canada's aboriginal peoples as a distinctive "characteristic of Canada," as well as Ottawa's obligation to help preserve aboriginal culture.

Second, creation of a "fast-track" mechanism to settle land claims. From almost all viewpoints, the resources allocated in this area are woefully lacking.

Third, the transfer of some powers to a government of first nations. These powers would include culture and education and they would be distinct from the local provincial powers.

Fourth, I think first nations should be given representation in the House of Commons. This gesture would allow native views as a collective to directly influence national affairs.

The Chair: Mr Naccarato, can you sum up please?

Mr Naccarato: To conclude, I believe there is a pause in the separatist march in Quebec. Recent public opinion polls and statements by prominent members of the Quebec

cabinet have advocated renewed federalism. Even Premier Bourassa has begun to reverse his insistence on bilateral talks. This committee should recommend to the Premier that he use Ontario's special relationship with Quebec to open the lines of communication. I strenuously urge our political leaders to take full advantage of this pause in the separatist march to make a strong, reasonable case for Canada.

My greatest hope is that a Canada will emerge in which the English and French communities, each with a deepened sense of security in language and culture, will forge genuine and lasting bonds. My greatest fear, however, is that the voices of reasonable and generous Canadians will be lost in a storm of emotionalism and selfishness. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Naccarato.

TADEUS LIPINSKI

The Chair: Tadeus Lipinski, followed by Lewis Eisen.

Mr Lipinski: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, my presentation, you will find, takes quite a different tack from the preceding ones, but I feel there is obviously a relationship.

Whenever we set out to partake in an activity, if you like, a game or a sport, anything from tiddly-winks to football, we go out with enthusiasm. We know the game is going to be played according to rules and those rules will be enforced.

The legal system of Ontario, and I expect in the remainder of Canada, is the single biggest obstacle in the way of people meeting their legitimate aspirations. That is the tragic reality, the tragic fact. We have a country which is so rich in natural resources that we have everything we can possibly need for our needs and for our pleasures. The one thing we do not have is a legal system which will deliver justice. One cannot look to the future in a system like that. None of the proposals for Canadian unity made by the numerous branches of the establishment offers us a focus for unity; none improves the prospect for the delivery of justice, not even justice according to the law.

The Charter of Rights and its appendix, the Meech Lake accord, were simply documents for the next attempted redistribution of power among those who are already wielding it and enjoying justice according to expectations. Those documents offered nothing for myself, my friends, my family and for you members who are not lawyers.

May I ask you a question, Mr Silipo? How many lawyers are there on this committee?

The Chair: There are three of us, sir, out of 12 members.

Mr Lipinski: Besides yourself, I take it, sir.

The Chair: I am incorrect, there are four of us.

Mr Lipinski: At least four. Mr Spicer of the federal committee on unity said that he hoped the Constitution would be written by the people, not by lawyers and politicians. Mr Rae says the decisions to be made about Canada are too important to leave to politicians, but he does not

exclude lawyers, and there sure is a delegation of lawyers in this committee.

[Laughter]

Mr Lipinski: I do not find that quite as humorous, Mr Silipo. I feel privileged to appear before this committee but I do regret, object to and feel a little insulted to find that at least 33% of the members are lawyers. That hardly represents the Legislature, the people of Ontario or the people of Canada. The legal profession seems to be placing itself in position for the kill, even before the prey is conceived.

The legal system is supposed to be our servant. Instead it is our master, and the people are just fodder for it. We are left to writhe in confused agony like earthworms in a fisherman's bait tin. The legal system must be brought back into the hands of the people. That task, members of the Legislature here who are not lawyers, is in your hands.

The privilege of self-government simply has to be withdrawn from the legal profession. There is nothing uniquely professional in the application of law. Every good parent knows how to maintain discipline and how to mete out justice. It is mind-boggling how the most important function of state, which is the delivery of justice to its citizens, can be left in the hands of such a self-serving rabidly free enterprise, self-governing group as provincial law societies of the provinces.

Speaking of Ontario, it is completely intolerable that 25,000 lawyers and judges in this province should hold one and all of us 9.7 million people to ransom at the first and slightest opportunity when we are thrust into association with them.

The Chair: Sir, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Lipinski: Consider the case of Sinclair Stevens. The Magna Carta evolved in response to the kind of liberty the federal government took. Consider the contempt for us and our laws that was revealed in the language in the disciplinary hearings. Consider the legalistic machination in the Starr affair, and the 50,000 charges which are being dropped in the courts of Ontario.

Members of the committee who are non-lawyers, you are in the majority. When it comes time to write the report on what you have heard, please follow your conscience and not the instructions and the advice of the lawyers. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. I have to say that I was under the impression that those of us who are lawyers were elected to the Legislature as representatives of our constituents and not as lawyers, but we will leave that as it is.

Mr Lipinski: Well, I could—

The Chair: No, we cannot get into a debate. I would love to, but we cannot.

2210

LEWIS EISEN

The Chair: Lewis Eisen, followed by Daniel Schwanen and Tim Whitehead.

Mr Eisen: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the committee. My name is Lewis Eisen, and I would like to address myself to question 5 on the discussion paper, the

le of English and French and, specifically, bilingualism Ontario.

I was born in Toronto, anglophone by birth. I have no French family or history. I speak French because it enriches my life and because being bilingual opens doors that do not open being unilingual, both in Canada and in other countries in the world.

I think bilingualism is very much misunderstood. Many Ontario residents are functionally bilingual: Throw them into a supermarket in the deepest regions of French-speaking Canada and they understand enough and can read enough French and can speak enough that they can do their shopping in French. They are functionally bilingual, but many of those people would not describe themselves as bilingual, because they are not fluently bilingual.

That is a very high standard, and the government does not seem to make that difference. Instead of saying, "I have extra skills; I can also communicate in a few words in this other language," people say, "Either I can do it in French or I can do it in English and if I can do it in both, then I'm bilingual." I do not think that approach is correct, and the problem is that the Ontario government, when it comes to bilingualism, does not promote the notion that the two languages can go together.

There are two Ontario government stations in Toronto. Instead of having quality programming in English and French, there is an English station and a French station. If you want to watch English, you go to one station; if you want to watch French, you go to another station. The Ontario government has separate directory listings in the Bell Canada phone book under the blue pages, but instead of having a consolidated listing of all the ministries with an English line and a French line, under each heading it has an English set of pages and a French set of pages. You go to one, you go to the other, but the two do not mix.

Even this particular booklet, *Changing for the Better*, A Public Discussion Paper, there is an English side and, if you want to know the French side, you have to turn the thing around and come at it from another way and then you can look at the French side. There is a very important message there. When you are looking at the English, the French side is upside down, cock-eyed, and the same from the other way around. This is not a bilingual book; this is an English book and a French book that have been bound together. There is a very important message there, and I do not think that message is good.

I would urge this committee to make three recommendations specifically with respect to bilingualism in Ontario: First, that the government take steps to foster and promote the notion of linguistic compatibility rather than linguistic separation; second, that the government undertake to study how to improve the image of bilingualism in Ontario—I am not an expert in sociolinguistics and the development of language policy, but there are people who are experts in that and I think it is time they were consulted; third, that the government should urge the federal government to follow suit, because the federal government has been just as guilty in separation of the language policies as the Ontario government.

I should add that what Quebec does with its language policies and the justice or injustice of its particular policies are not relevant. We are not kids playing a hockey game, saying, "If they're going to play rough, we're going to play rough." What they do with their policies is their business and no matter what happens with Quebec, Ontario should be looking to develop its bilingual policies in a fair fashion to its residents.

TIM WHITEHEAD
DANIEL SCHWANEN

The Chair: I invite next Daniel Schwanen and Tim Whitehead, followed by Monica Stritzky.

Mr Whitehead: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Tim Whitehead. I am an anglophone, born and raised in southern Ontario. With me is Daniel Schwanen, a genuine francophone, one, moreover, from Quebec. Some time ago, we thought this difference in our backgrounds might allow us to find common ground, and if we could find common ground in our views of Canada and government in general, perhaps there might follow a basis for finding some of the solutions that the country so desperately needs.

In the months of talking this over, we did not manage to see eye to eye on everything. In fact, up until a few hours ago, I was still hoping Daniel would see the light, but no luck. We did find an awful lot of things in common. In particular, one of the things that troubled us greatly about the debate is that it is too often seen as a battle between Quebec and the rest of Canada, or French and English, and we think that is very misleading. We think we must see this as a debate about Canada, that Quebec has its problems, but the west has its problems and the native people have their problems. There are many problems with the status quo, and if we put it as a dichotomy, we will never find a solution. We must all be looking for common ground. Moreover, we see it too often as a crisis situation. We think it is very important that we see this rather as an opportunity to fix some of the problems the nation has and think of it as the constitutional arrangement.

Another fundamental view we shared was that the key here is good governance, in particular the ratio between government, whatever level, and the governed. These and other shared views caused us to think that maybe there were a couple of areas where we could make a contribution to the debate. Like us, Canadians share an awful lot in common, but there are misconceptions. We think the misconceptions are the basis for a lot of the problems we are having in reaching conclusions and solutions.

For example, we hear very often—the committee has probably heard it—that bilingualism is a major cause of the deficit. That is palpable nonsense. We also hear that Quebec is a major drain on federal finances. Fundamentally, that just is not true and the numbers are not there to show it.

We have a number of recommendations related to good governance. I will list them very briefly. There is transparency. Individuals need to be able to understand how their money is being spent. We have some recommendations regarding representativeness, in which we see a basis for

good governance. We see the need for respect for rights—and we surprised ourselves in this, that we saw that the need for a strong Charter of Rights could only be achieved with the “notwithstanding” clause. We were somewhat surprised by that conclusion.

My final point is that we need efficiency in government; that deals with the overlapping of powers between the federal and the provincial levels, but also with how those powers are enacted. I pass over to Daniel.

Mr Schwanen: In the time you left me. We have agreed along those lines. We have agreed on a number of recommendations towards implementing better efficiency in government, which all Canadians badly need. Where a delivery of a program is best done at the provincial level, power or spending authority now shared between the provincial and federal governments should be attributed primarily to provincial governments. Welfare or manpower training or UI even could fall under this category. Both the delivery and the financing of shared-cost programs such as education and health services should be the exclusive responsibility of the provinces, and they should, of course, be able to raise corresponding amounts of money.

However, our aim is certainly not to emasculate the federal government. We propose two types of powers which should fall under the responsibility of the federal government. First, Ottawa should have the power to override provincial laws to the extent that they do not conform to Canada's international obligations or that they hinder free trade between provinces, which we certainly do not have at the moment.

Second, in areas which are under exclusive provincial control, the federal government could still get involved along the lines of the European model, that is, Ottawa could set up bureaus or secretariats and through these would be empowered to study and formulate recommendations for common social policies, improved co-ordination of fiscal policies, national standards, etc. The federal government would call periodic, publicly held conferences with provincial representatives to discuss these issues.

2220

Over the long run, we would expect this process would result in the harmonization of social and economic policies across the country without coercion. If the government of any one province, say Quebec, decided to follow a different path in certain policy areas, this process would allow it to do so while allowing the rest of Canada to continue with perhaps greater integration in certain areas like education.

The Chair: Sir, could you sum up, please.

Mr Schwanen: We also have some recommendations on the process which would help us reach a new constitutional understanding, and that would be a constitutional convention which would be nominated along a process we describe in our brief.

To summarize, we believe that a country which works well, works efficiently, is a country where people can more easily live in harmony. That was just a quick summary of our thoughts and recommendations.

Je voudrais remercier le comité de nous avoir donné la chance de nous exprimer. Merci.

The Chair: We have your complete brief and we will take a look at it.

MONICA STRITZKY

The Chair: Monica Stritzky, followed by Shaul Ezer.

Ms Stritzky: My speech tonight is very brief, but it states my viewpoint on what I have seen so far. I believe the Meech Lake accord was the straw that broke the camel's back for this country. Up to now the people of Canada have been giving their tax dollar to the federal government, trusting it would make the appropriate decisions so that we can continue to survive emotionally, spiritually and economically together.

Unfortunately, the people have been let down again and only the privileged get to reap the rewards of our hard-earned tax dollar. One of these privileged groups appears to be the French, through no work of their own but rather by grovelling about how their people are not understood or are inhumanely treated. They continue to manipulate our federal government into giving them more federal economic powers.

I have always been taught to believe that a person's self-worth came from hard work and the pride he put into his work, not by manipulating other cultures to give him handouts. With this in mind, I feel it is time for Canada to develop a new attitude, one in which the people have pride and respect for all the people in the country so that each person can develop his or her own self-worth. With this attitude, we can develop the competitive spirit needed so we can continue to compete with other countries on both economic and political levels.

Also, I feel it is not just Quebec which should define the so-called new Canada, but rather the new Canada should define what it wants to Quebec, involving, of course, all immigrant groups, and Quebec should define what it wants with Canada. Of course, in the future, my hopes are that Canada will remain together with all 10 provinces staying together in the Confederation, but not through blackmail. After all, it is not just French-speaking people who own Quebec; it belongs to all of Canada and all its Canadians.

If things continue to progress at the rate they are going it will not be long before all our human rights are taken away from us. The unconciliatory is not what is required today. That is the method we have been using for the last 200 years which has brought us to this moment in time. I ask you, the politicians, to do what is right for the continuous positive growth of this country.

SHAUL EZER

The Chair: I call Shaul Ezer, followed by Harold Beatson.

Mr Ezer: Members of the committee, including the lawyers, thank you for persevering to this late hour.

I think some consider that we are in a period of national crisis with disaffection in Quebec, the west and the native groups. I think we can also consider this to be an opportunity to create a new alignment of federal and provincial powers that would reduce overlap in programs between the two levels, decrease the overall cost of government and

lengthen provincial control over regional matters while permitting Ottawa to concentrate on truly national issues. I think these reforms are necessary whether or not Quebec separates.

In terms of a new alignment of powers, I think this is the way to preserve the Canadian federation, and we need to recognize that it is both useful and necessary for Ottawa to reduce its role in many local and regional matters. I think what Quebec wants is probably similar to what the rest wants, which is a bigger role in certain areas like education, manpower training, culture and communications, at least in local broadcasting. This means decentralization in regional areas. In my view, this is what was intended in 1867 and is what all of Canada, not just Quebec, needs at this time in our history.

At the same time, it should be recognized that it makes no sense for the provinces to remain involved in truly national issues. These include securities regulation, which is now a provincial matter, and it should be a national one, regulation of telephones or having overseas missions, as many provinces do. Further studies would identify other areas where powers may be swapped to achieve a more national and efficient federalism. From a historical perspective, the Canadian Constitution gives the provinces a strong role alongside the federal government. I think this has been the case, and there is no need to change that because of the diversity and the large geography we have in Canada.

The second aspect of Canadian history we need to recognize is that there are two phases. From Confederation until about the Great Depression, Canadians looked to the provinces to deal with many of their problems. Then we went into the second phase at about the time of the Second World War, where Canada faced truly national problems like the Depression and the world war. These problems had to be addressed by the national government; consequently, in many cases the federal government encroached into provincial areas. Canadians have by and large accepted this growth of federal power as necessary to meet national needs. However, we need to move to a phase three.

The Depression, the world wars and even the Cold War are behind us. Many of our current problems can best be handled by the provinces; environmental problems, education, health, culture and the like can better be handled by the provinces. Yet Ottawa collects a disproportionate amount of Canadian taxes that are not well placed to pay for health, education and social programs.

It is going to be difficult to agree as to what is properly a national issue or regional issue. I think that is less important than agreeing that one level of government should handle a particular matter. For instance, one area of great overlap is telecommunications and broadcasting. The federal government has the CRTC regulating telephones, but the provincial governments have 10 other regulators which regulate telephones as well. It almost does not matter who does it, as long as one is designated to do it. Broadcasting is an area which can be split off and divided. You can divide the radio frequency spectrum. Again, I do not think one should feel strongly about which, the province or the

federal government, handles a particular matter as long as the lines are sharply divided.

Every 10 years we reform the Bank Act, but it has been 130, 140 years and we have not really reformed the Constitution. I think we should have regular constituent assemblies or federal-provincial conferences every 10, 20, 30 years to sharpen up the edges in the division of powers.

Some people are concerned that this would mean we are going to lose a strong federal government or that power will be transferred from the provinces to the federal government or vice versa. I do not think this really matters. I think what matters is the practical question of which level of government is in a better position to deal with a particular problem. In the next 20 years we might make a mistake in transferring a certain matter to the wrong jurisdiction, but we can transfer it back later on as long as we are open to change.

With respect to Meech Lake, some ask how we are going to obtain major transfers of power to the provinces when even the modest transfer contained in the Meech Lake accord was rejected. The answer is that Meech Lake only addressed Quebec's needs, and I think we need to address the needs of all the other provinces and the native people. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. Once again, we have your brief and we will read the complete brief.

2230

HAROLD BEATSON

The Chair: Harold Beatson, followed by James Boles.

Mr Beatson: Thank you, Mr Chairman. "Canada at the Crossroads." At this point in history your discussion paper is both interesting and timely, for as a Canadian who loves his country, I am of the opinion that we have been federally leaderless since the departure of the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau. However, I am encouraged by the remote possibility that a successor is on the horizon in the person of Clyde Wells, presently Premier of Newfoundland. My opinion is based on a number of examples; however, I enlarge on only one, that being the Meech Lake accord, an issue we remember too well.

Manitoba and Newfoundland were the dissenters in daring to reach a decision to ratify or reject the accord, which for the most part was recognizing Quebec as a distinct society. On 22 June 1990 I watched the final debate in the House of Assembly, Newfoundland, and also the announcement by Lowell Murray at 1 pm daylight time advising all and sundry that, based on the Newfoundland vote ratifying the accord, he would seek to obtain a ruling on a rolling deadline concept from the Supreme Court of Canada in order to allow Manitoba to hold a public hearing at a later date, due to the delaying tactics, I presume, of Elijah Harper. Clyde Wells, on returning from dinner, adjourned the House of Assembly without a vote, even though the Conservative opposition used every tactic in the book to force a vote. Clyde Wells said Newfoundland would not be manipulated.

The Prime Minister's chief Constitution negotiator, unelected Senator Lowell Murray, killed the Meech Lake

accord by his own tactical blunder in announcing the rolling deadline concept idea before the Newfoundland vote, for he was attempting, as Clyde Wells announced, to manipulate Newfoundland. Nevertheless, the Meech Lake accord was not to be. The Prime Minister, in all his wisdom, forgot or neglected to deal with another distinct society, the aboriginal peoples. A referendum re this important legislation by the government would have sufficed and eliminated all the wheeling and dealing and rolling of the dice, which ended up for naught.

The present federal government, we know, represents only 43% of Canadians, while holding a majority of seats in the House. Unfair. And do they ever take advantage of it. Example: 80% of Canadians rejected the GST by way of voice and petitions. Result: shoved down their throats anyway.

I challenge the present Ontario government and opposition to take the lead in forging a new Canada with a united vision by reviewing and changing provincial policy as an example to other regions as follows: (1) Put God back in the Legislature. As is apparent from watching the proceedings during sittings, he is sadly missing, as is his wisdom also. (2) Declare a week of solid prayer by all faiths to reunite Canada, which will hopefully include Quebec. Call on all clergy to pick up this declaration and ensure media exposure. (3) Have House leaders of all parties meet in a spirit of co-operation to assess the province's position in respect to all issues and resolve to solve all problems on an equitable basis using the free vote by all sitting members to reach unified solutions.

The Chair: Sir, could you sum up, please.

Mr Ezer: What does Ontario want? We want to remain in Canada as always with our neighbour Quebec included while we enjoy friendly rivalry with all regions. At no time would we not be there to help if and when needed. English or French speaking, I am sure all regions are of the same opinion, and that is what makes us all Canadian.

JAMES BOLES

The Chair: James Boles, followed by Sean Mulcahy.

Mr Boles: Mr Chairman, committee members, I am grateful for the chance to appear before you. I am 77 years old. I am a retired engineer. I graduated from Queen's in engineering and I have a diploma from Toronto in business administration.

Among the other things that I have done is a lot of accounting, and chief in experience I guess is my army experience in the Second World War. I finished the Second World War as a major, but the thing that I think I want to say to you is that I lived in the best part of Canada when Canadians were the best they have ever been, not because I was there, but because they were there. They were hardworking, determined. They were prepared to put their lives on the line. They paid their debts. The trains ran. All sorts of things happened in my day which I do not think you ladies and gentlemen are going to see again.

Now, I have not time to cover all the points which are in my brief. The whole tenure of the meeting before you tonight has been that there is no faith in our political system, little faith in our politicians and we have no way of fixing it. I

think to start at the beginning, we have a lot of trouble between the English and Quebec. We assume because the Allaire report says that there will be a referendum in Quebec within 18 months to two years that there will be an idea that the result of that referendum will have Quebec decide to leave or stay. I suggest to you that, as Canadians, you have half of what is to say in that, and if Quebec wants to leave, as far as I am concerned we say to it: "You got your underwear. You don't take any part of the country."

That brings up the point that we are facing a decision about whether the country breaks up or we have a civil war. I do not want to appear bloodthirsty. I do not feel that way. I have worked in Montreal. I have lots of good French friends. I cannot see how you can think about Canada without thinking about Richard or those beautiful engineering students who were shot. Do not anybody tell me that we have not got a feeling for the French.

But the politicians of Quebec are playing a game and they are playing it for all the stakes they can get, so my first point is that I would like the Ontario Premier to impress upon the other premiers, and particularly the Prime Minister, that somebody has to stand up and say, "Nobody leaves Canada."

I do not care whether it is Newfoundland deciding their entry into Canada was a mistake. They are in and they have to face the music. Quebec is not going to go because Quebecers were the first ones in the valley or because they speak French and we do not or whatever happens. They stick around and they fight it out with us. Western Canada is not going to go just because its people like shopping in the United States. I just want to say to you that if you are a Canadian, you have to face the music. This point has not been brought up and I hope that we will not fail to clearly state that there might be some awful consequences of a split.

The Chair: Sir, if you would sum up, please.

Mr Boles: Okay. The other point I want to make (the main value is that we need a referendum system which overrides all other powers, a referendum system which can upset any decision made, withdraw MPs, etc. If problems are so great that we have to have a decision like that, it to be done by all Canadians and not just a few in any particular government.

2240

ALLIANCE OF CANADIAN CINEMA,
TELEVISION AND RADIO ARTISTS

The Chair: From ACTRA, Sean Mulcahy.

Mr Mulcahy: My name is Sean Mulcahy. I am the president of the Toronto performers of the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists, commonly known under the acronym of ACTRA. I thought I might steal a few seconds by talking while I moved. I am also a Canadian artist and therefore quite accustomed to anonymity.

I have not found my three-hour wait unpleasant. It has given me an opportunity to walk the hallowed halls of the august building and look at the oil paintings of great men who I have played: Brock, James Wolfe and of course John Graves Simcoe, the first Governor General of Upper Canada before he was elevated to the peerage by the royal

of directors of an American hotel chain. These were the days when our radio was the admiration of the entire world and before the arid, bleak transmission system that we have today.

Having got your attention, Mr Chairman, much political lipservice has been paid to the importance of culture to the survival and growth of Canada. Canadians are beginning to recognize the concept of cultural distinction as the vital key to our success in the world economy. Only the province of Quebec has given it the prominence it deserves. What we need now are practical applications of the concept in the context of the economy of Ontario, which is still the engine which powers our development as a nation.

We represent almost 6,000 professional artists in the city of Toronto, and like our colleagues in Quebec, we have no legal, political or economic status except by the goodwill of our engagers. Our collective agreements exist by virtue of voluntary recognition within our industry. By enacting status-of-the-artist legislation, the government of Ontario will send a clear signal to the artists of the province and the rest of Canada that culture is an essential key to growth.

This is not a self-serving proposal. We direct the attention of this committee to the recent study by the Ontario Film Development Corp on the socioeconomic impact of film and television in Ontario. Though not exhaustive, it estimates that the industry generates over \$2 billion annually to the provincial economy.

As the largest single group within the industry, ACTRA performers are major players in the fastest-growing sector of the economy: information processing. Our creative contribution is applied in commerce, entertainment, education, training and retraining. As performers, teachers, technologists and producers, we are essential to the form and content of the telecommunications media, media which must be developed if Ontario is to maintain a lead role in helping to define the future of our nation.

Historically, telecommunications has been regulated by the federal government. Quebec, for over a decade, has suggested that this ought to be a provincial domain. It has argued that it needs control of telecommunications to ensure the survival and development of its distinct culture. Ontario has held that this aspect of cultural distinction is a national priority. ACTRA has agreed. Yet now when the fabric of the country is under such stress, we may have to examine more carefully the reality of the impact of recorded media on the daily lives of Canadians.

We no longer believe that this province and the rest of the country can wait for federal leadership before acting to ensure that our economy meets the challenge of the information revolution juggernaut. With the advent of direct broadcast satellites and fibre optics distribution systems, the people of Ontario and Canada will be swamped with information products before the year 2000. Unless this process is regulated to include a significant portion of domestic product, our national identity, consciousness, whatever you want to call it, may virtually disappear.

For reasons of healthy self-interest, we the performers of Ontario do not want this to happen. The development of meaningful status-of-the-artist legislation for Ontario will

be an effective step towards a renewed and revitalized Confederation. A country that recognizes its artists will find it easier to recognize itself. One only has to look at Quebec to see the link between cultural confidence and a healthy dynamism in the country.

Properly conceived, such a bill will embrace the realities we face in education as well as commerce and entertainment. Early this month we attended a conference co-sponsored by this government and held at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. There we heard from national and international leaders in education and business. We were repeatedly reminded that the work of education and commerce are inextricably connected in a rapidly changing world. Thomas Kierans, head of the C. D. Howe Institute, stated that big business, both domestic and multinational, recognizes the importance of the arts in educating the workforce for the future. The fact is that our human capital, the graduates of our educational institutions, must be prepared for not one but four or five careers as they enter the workforce. We understand this very well.

As the largest single group within the information-producing industry, ACTRA performers represent what may be the key sector for economic growth into the next century: the organized self-employed. Most of us hold at least three jobs now. The skills we have learned as artists have given us this flexibility. We who live this reality can help provide the insight and information to make adjustment and growth possible.

As a society, we must change our ways of thinking if we are to exploit the creativity of the workforce. It is vital that this new government, which is seen by many Canadians as a potential source of fresh vision for the future of Confederation, formally recognizes the importance of cultural expression to our economic growth and wellbeing. If we continue to regard our cultural industries as marginal icing on the cake, we may become the largest Third World country in the world. Ignore your artists at your peril, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Although some of the faces are familiar to some of us, we do need people to introduce themselves, if you would, or if you would introduce them just for the record.

Mr Mulcahy: Oh, sorry. Jonathan Welsh, Martin Doyle.

Ms Harper: Kyra Harper.

Mr Mulcahy: And of course my dear friend David Ferry from Newfoundland. It does not mean he is a bad person.

Ms Harper: I am from there too.

Mr Mulcahy: I am sorry. And the man who has done so much to put this together, Sandy Crawley. I will leave you with one last thought: If you want to find an actor in this city, all you have to do is stand up and say, "Waiter." Try to change that, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: We will. Thank you.

2250

JOHN HOPKINS

The Chair: John Hopkins, our next speaker. We have then one final speaker after that, Edith Silver.

Mr Hopkins: Thanks very much, Mr Chairman and members of the committee, for letting me have the opportunity to speak to you. I was kind of surprised at that last group of people, but it is a really funny coincidence because I came here to talk about the role of film and television in terms of programming which can help get a handle on what is happening to Canada right now.

What I have been trying to put together is a film about John A. Macdonald, who comes back from the past to find out what has happened to Canada because he is kind of turning over in his grave. He meets a journalist who becomes his eyes for him, and she goes around documenting people, the same way you are going around Ontario. You need a focus on such a thing because it is so complex, so I decided to focus on Atlantic Canada and the region as a way of speaking about what Canada is in the sum of its parts.

This debate going on right now is not a debate about Quebec and Ontario. It is not something that is confined to that parameter. It is something that includes the whole country. I have noticed since I have been here that there has been an overwhelming emphasis on Ontario and Quebec as the players in this game, and I want to underline that that is not the case.

This John A. character idea does not seem to be working out really very well because, from my research down there, most people hate him; they just do not like him at all. It goes way back to the original Charlottetown conference in 1864, where the original concept of that conference was maritime union. It was not Confederation of all the British colonies in Upper and Lower Canada and the rest of the other colonies in the east.

I guess the figure who, in their minds, best represents their interests is Joseph Howe. Joseph Howe was someone who could speak for how they felt in terms of their pride, their feeling that, "We really didn't need Ontario." Ontario and Quebec were actually bankrupt, and they needed to build a railway. They could not get along with each other—Quebec and Ontario wanted to split up from the very beginning—so John A. Macdonald, through some inspiration from George Brown, decided to go down there and basically gatecrash this maritime union party and decide on proposing what eventually ended up as the BNA Act, which has been, from what I am saying, the downfall of that region.

In terms of what I am proposing, from what I have found out going around interviewing people since last spring in doing the research for this film, people down there feel a united Canada would be a desirable thing, but I am afraid that feeling is dissipating very rapidly, and there has not been enough contact between Ontario and Atlantic Canada in terms of communication on these concerns. If Quebec separates—and the way I see it, it probably will—between Atlantic Canada and Ontario, I am afraid, from what I can see, there definitely is going to be a split.

You have to look at the options for Atlantic Canada in that case. Can it maintain a relationship with the rest of Canada under those circumstances? Or should it decide to go as it wanted to do in the first place, which is maritime union, hopefully with Newfoundland? Newfoundland is

very independent, all on its own, so where do you go from there? You can say, "Well, perhaps we'll do a sovereignty association deal with Quebec, as they're closer, and Ontario to BC can form their own jurisdiction."

Anyhow, there is perhaps the option of joining the United States, as Buchanan mentioned. It is probably the only thing that has caught any attention in Ontario since this whole thing started, to give you an indication of need to open up communication and perhaps take the interests of this panel beyond the borders of Ontario and really get at some of the meat in what you are talking about.

Last, I would like to say that in terms of doing this film I have talked to every major network. They are saying there is no market for films like this, that we only want movies and miniseries. Any film about Canada is not marketable. It is a real sad thing to think you cannot make films, documentaries, or whatever. The market comes first and the interest and benefit, in terms of that information getting across to Canadians, is last.

EDITH SILVER

The Chair: Edith Silver.

Ms Silver: Mr Chairman, committee members, ladies and gentlemen—there are still a few left. First, I would like to commend the current federal government for appointing this commission, thus showing courage and conviction of democracy by hearing Canadians across this country. I would like to thank this committee for its diligence in carrying out this task.

This is contrary to the stifled, frustrated people who had no input when former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau foisted what I referred to then and now as a "charter of wrongs" on us. I wonder how many other Canadians found it strange that while all the negotiating and horse trading the charter was taking place, there was a postal strike preventing communications, as well as a nationwide CBI strike which prevented millions of Canadians from hearing discussion or debate of the pros and cons. Then, just a few days before the documents were to be signed, suddenly both strikes ended with most Canadians having had no say in what would affect their daily lives then and far into the future.

The following are matters that I believe should be included in a revised Constitution:

1. The right to defend our country and ourselves is not present in the charter of wrongs. The oft-stated aim of the Soviet Union is world domination. The vice-president of the USSR is a hardline communist who rose through the ranks and does not share Mr Gorbachev's reformist bent. We have gone from having the fourth-largest and best navy in the world after the Second World War to having three and a half ships and one or two for cannibalization for parts. We have been placing the onus on the United States to defend us. So much for our vaunted independence.

2. The right to strike should be present. Essential services should be subject to fair and binding arbitration. The Toronto Transit Commission found out the hard way when it challenged in the courts a few years ago that there is no right to strike. The charter says we have freedom of association, meaning a meeting may be held.

3. The right to own property should be present in our constitution. Property does not just mean real estate; it also includes a car, boat, jewellery and anything else you own, including the shirt on your back.

4. I believe it was in June 1981 that an order in council was passed with very wide powers re civilian internment camps here in Canada, just one of many orders in council pushed through by Mr Trudeau and his cabinet without parliamentary debate, without the knowledge or awareness, on this day, by most Canadians. This order in council should be rescinded in a so-called free and democratic country.

300

My last point:

5. We all value freedom of expression, but we must be careful not to confuse freedom with licence. We must have the wisdom to recognize the difference and the courage to insist on a standard of behaviour that treats all fairly and does not turn a blind eye to harm, whether physical or to the peace of mind of minorities, visible or not.

I conclude with a quote from Dr Lee Salk, who was speaking on parenting on the former radio station CKO: "There is no such thing as freedom unless there are limits. Freedom requires boundaries or else it becomes not caring. The same way 'yes' has no meaning in a language that lacks the word 'no,' so does freedom have no meaning unless there are limits to what is acceptable behaviour."

I would just like to finish with one further little thing. Last Sunday on the CBC, the *Air Force* asked the question, in a humorous way, "How many Canadians does it take to change a lightbulb?" The answer was: "None. Canadians don't like to make changes. They like to accept things the way they are." I think what you have heard here tonight from all the many people who had something very valuable to say will show that that is not the case. They do want to make changes. Thank you again for listening to us all.

The Chair: Thank you, madam.

I just want to check, because I know there is at least one other person in the audience who would like to be heard. I just want to see, because if we go beyond, then in fairness I think we have to also allow others. How many people would like to speak to the committee? Three still. Are people prepared to carry on? If you could be as brief as possible, we would appreciate it.

NOLA CREW

The Chair: Nola Crew I know. I do not know the other names, but we will go in order.

Ms Crew: Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to get the last three in.

If I could briefly introduce myself, although I belong to many number of groups, I am not representing any of them. I am a mother of five children working on the next generation of grandchildren, which makes the eighth generation of Canadians. I am a former trustee of the Toronto board and have a background in history of women's studies. But I think what gives me my greatest appreciation of the diversity of our country is practising in the area of family law. In there I see the same kind of tension a nation has that sometimes works and sometimes does not work. I like to think of it as a cultural tension, whether it is between

what men think marriage is and what women think marriage is or whether it is what people coming from different parts of the world and meeting each other in Toronto and trying to make marriages is.

That same kind of friction I see in our country. Different people with different ideas is not necessarily unhealthy. Somehow in Canada we approach any kind of tension as basically wrong; we have to do something to solve it. I think it is a healthy tension. I am not talking about things like racial bigotry or something of that nature, just the tension, the friction that is a legitimate cost of doing business in an egalitarian democracy.

I worry sometimes about our Constitution, which enshrines differences, which gives different status, different rights to people based on religion or based on handicap or based on when they arrived in Canada or what language they speak. I would much prefer a Constitution that simply stated that all people are equal.

I think we should concentrate on our similarities, not our differences, upon our essential humanity when we come together to try and plan for our country's future. We have a tradition of evolution that somehow got mixed up a couple of decades ago and started adopting the styles of countries that have a revolutionary background. We abandoned teaching the students of our schools the traditions of our parliamentary democracy. We got into a system where we more and more associate our Queen with not being the head of the Commonwealth, which broadens us, but being the Queen of another country.

I think we need to concentrate more on how similar we are to people around the world throughout our country, instead of unfortunately becoming increasingly parochial and selfish. And I do think the recent constitutional meetings we have had over the last decades have been, to use the word, provincial. We really are becoming terribly provincial in our outlook, and it is not useful to us or to our country's future.

We have a chance to show the world a truly working federal model that encourages diversity in a working mosaic, and I think that is what all of us really want, instead of the kind of petty looking after ourselves that has tended to characterize certainly the Meech Lake debates, of "What am I going to get out of it?" and "What's in it for me?"—Ontario, BC, Newfoundland, Quebec. I would ask the members of this committee, as you go into your deliberations and as you pass the word along to the other members of this honourable body, let's work at making Canada an outward-looking nation, supportive of all our peoples, where we all are equal as individuals and represent and respect the needs of our individuals.

Thank you very much for letting me speak.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Crew. Nice to see you again, Nola.

BILL BELLIVEAU

The Chair: Bill Belliveau.

Mr Belliveau: I have been waiting so long I am not sure if I have a voice left, but we will give it a try. I did submit a brief, so I am just going to lift a couple of highlights from it in the interest of time.

Your discussion paper asked the question: What holds Canada together? In my view, there are many factors, but the ones that stand out for me are the following: the principle of sharing or equalization that has permitted people in all parts of Canada to enjoy a minimum standard of living in this country; the powerful respect for the law and institutions of government; a shared belief in justice, freedom and democracy; a national transportation system; national media like the CBC, Maclean's magazine or the Globe and Mail; Foster Hewitt, Danny Gallivan and the National Hockey League; fear of absorption by the United States; 200 years of influence by the British; a prosperous east-west economy, and a love-hate relationship between the French and the English.

Decentralization: For many years, Canada has subscribed to a policy of cross-subsidization, based on the principle that all Canadians would enjoy a minimum standard of living and government services. This policy was enforced by the terms of cost-sharing and transfer payments to the provinces. The term "decentralization" used in the context of current constitutional debate is code for two philosophies of the Mulroney government: (1) give Quebec what it wants by offering to transfer powers to all provinces; and (2) cut the deficit by transferring the costs of government services from the federal to the provincial governments, user-pay by another term.

In a decentralized Canada, there would be two and maybe three classes of citizenship based on wealth and the ability to pay. In our preoccupation with Quebec, we should not overlook the fact that Michael Wilson has already started the process of decentralization without the approval of Canadian voters and without constitutional authority.

Division of powers: The principle that should govern the functional division of powers in Canada is subsidiarity, meaning that functions which subordinate or lower-level organizations perform more effectively should belong properly to them rather than to a central authority or government. In respect to Canada, subsidiarity would assign to the federal government those functional tasks whose dimensions or effects extend beyond provincial borders, while assigning to the provinces those functional tasks whose dimensions or effects are confined largely within provincial borders and relate directly to the management and delivery of services to individuals within those provinces.

In any discussion about Quebec, it is important to place certain events of history in perspective. The French were the first European explorers to Canada and the first European settlers in Canada. Indeed, at one point New France stretched from Cape Breton Island to the Great Lakes and south to the Gulf of Mexico. The British military occupied Quebec and denied the French majority self-government for 112 years after the conquest. Today, neither the French nor the English represent 25% of the Canadian population.

2310

Is there a Canadian identity? National identity is formed by the history and actions of a nation. If Canada is defined by its differences from the United States, it is also defined by its unresolved wars between the French and the English. It is defined by more than 300 years of colonization, first by the French and then by the English. It is

defined by a 200-year relationship with Great Britain. It is defined by war with the Americans and trade with the Americans. It is defined by a multicultural population unrelated to French and English that is approaching 50% of our total. It is defined by cultural invasion from the United States, burned daily into our subconscious by television film and broadcast entertainment. It is blurred by a lap-dance foreign policy and the surrendering of our economic sovereignty. There is, however, one constant throughout, that is the French and the English.

Two themes have been consistent in Quebec for the last 15 years, sovereignty and association. Quebec uses the European Community as a model for sovereignty-association. The European Act of 1985 provides for the demolition of trade barriers by majority vote, not unanimity. Majority vote would override sovereignty. As Europe moves towards constitutional reform and political union, it will further submerge national sovereignty, not increase it. Lis Bissonnette, publisher of *Le Devoir*, describes sovereignty association as a formula for Quebec "trying to leave without going anywhere," to leave and to stay, to have it all. I am more inclined to describe it as schizophrenia. Indeed the entire sovereigntist movement may be schizophrenic. Consider, for example—

The Chair: Sir, could you sum up please.

Mr Belliveau: All right. I am going to skip that and just go directly to my recommendations. Is there a common ground? I believe the common ground is the economy, and I make these recommendations: that we agree to declare Quebec sovereign in matters of language and protection of its culture; that we recognize the specific sovereignty by exempting Quebec in the Charter of Rights from matters of language and culture; that we give serious consideration to the government of Ontario declaring official bilingualism that all provinces agree to initiate compulsory language instruction in both French and English from grades 1 to 12; that new immigrants receive or achieve some basic proficiency in French and English language and history as a condition of citizenship; that we consider a formal declaration of Canada's independence from England and the British monarchy.

STEPHEN JOHNSON

The Chair: Stephen Johnson. We have added on other speaker after Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson: In that case, Mr Chairman, you deprived me of my wonderful opening joke, which is that I hope I will be last but definitely not least. My name is Stephen Johnson. I am a graduate student at the University of Toronto, and I think I represent the most potentially endangered group of individuals in our society, that is, the group of people who spend their lives studying the Constitution. If you guys find an answer, I will be out of work and I am very young, so please do not do anything drastic.

This commission is empowered or in charge of a number of things. One is functional and one is perhaps practical. The practical one is that this committee, like the other travelling the country right now, is more of an end in itself than a means to an end. The facility of giving people the feeling of being heard and articulating views which, b

and large, have nothing to do with the Constitution, is a very valuable one.

I would like to focus my very brief comments—I have written a brief and it is in there somewhere, I have no idea where, but maybe it will be found. Who knows? Maybe it will be read. I would like to focus upon two general points leading to seven assumptions and 12 definite recommendations.

The two general points are these: First, the nature of a Constitution is not a document which is meant to be a blueprint encompassing all of the preferences of a given society. To have people articulate concerns, legitimate though they may be, ranging from the municipal structure to the use of certain elements in different areas is all very interesting, but not constitutional. A Constitution is meant to embody fundamental principles and the structure of governance. When we look at our own Constitution as it presently stands, we find it embodies a great many contradictory buzzwords or isms.

If we look at it, we find we are attempting to reconcile great many contradictory things, which begs the question: What is the unit of analysis we choose to use? Is it to be the province, in which case we will adopt provincialism? Is it to be the region, in which case we will adopt regionalism? Indeed, is it to be that which the charter envisions, individualism? Is our unit of analysis to be that which our friends in Quebec would advocate, perhaps a dualistic notion of our nation? Are we to then empower races and have multiculturalism be it, or are we to succumb to a sense of collective historic guilt and weep for environmentalism and aboriginalism? All valid concerns, yes, but we must decide what is to be the unit of analysis.

I would refer you to section 22 of the Constitution, which is the only section where we can have any idea of what perhaps the original intention was. When we read the section, we see it discusses the sections of the country, that being the 19th-century conception of what we would call a region.

I work from the following assumptions:

My first assumption is that our system is unnecessarily marked by executive supremacy. That which we have in our government does not resemble representative or responsible government, as any political scientist would understand it. You are neither representative nor responsible, as given the constraints of party dominance of our executive system. We vote once every four years and that is it.

The second assumption is that executive supremacy at the federal level has made central institutions, such as the cabinet and the Senate, ultimately meaningless, especially as articulators of regional concerns.

Third: As an effect of assumptions one and two, there has been a loss of identification with and faith in Ottawa.

Fourth: Given the failings of the central government, forces of regionalism and provincialism have taken on entrenched and defining roles in Canadian politics which have served to balkanize the nation at the expense of any sense of national consciousness.

Fifth: The lack of national consciousness has led to the institutionalization of what I would call solitudes, not the traditional two solitudes but solitudes of different groups,

as people seek to identify themselves with a cause or a symbol, be that the cause of women, the cause of a certain sexual orientation or whatever, all valid preferences and political concerns, but fundamentally not issues of constitutional merit.

Sixth: People lose faith in politics and politicians. They move ever and ever and ever more towards a legalization of politics, and a greater reliance upon writing things down, such as we find in a written Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This inevitably leads to the substitution of a legal for a political conception of our society, and fundamentally impoverishes the political discourse of our nation.

The seventh assumption is that Canada is a function of political will, as it makes no economic sense whatsoever.

Now let us look at some ideas. It is my belief that we can reform our central institutions so as to try and locate the forces which are tearing us apart at the central level. I would advocate a preferential ballot, that is, one in which a set of markings actually would rank the candidates one, two, three, so you would arrive at people being elected not on a simple first-past-the-post plurality system but on a basis whereby the individual chosen would be at least the first or second choice of the majority of the constituents. I would also move to have a special ballot for our aboriginal peoples, one with equal weight, yes, but it would identify them as aboriginals, and that becomes important now.

There is a lot of talk about elected senates, but we must understand that ours is a representative government in which the executive depends for its survival upon the confidence of the Parliament, both houses. We cannot elect our Senate in the exact way as the Americans do. We cannot pretend we are the United States of America, for theirs is not a responsible system. Ours is.

I would advocate a system of indirect election of the Senate. It would work as follows: In every federal election you have an aggregation of the vote in the different regions. You would then determine from that, for instance—let's be very ambitious and please the will of the majority of the committee—let's say the NDP won 50% of the vote in Ontario in a federal election, the Conservatives won 25% and the Liberals won 25%. Ontario would be allocated a certain number of senators; I would advocate 24. The NDP would get 50% of those, that is to say, 12. They could then use these appointments to bring forward a number of causes, a greater representation. The majority of you are white and the majority of you are men. You are not representative of our society, but if you had 12 appointments you could use, you could put in women and aboriginal groups or whatever you choose.

I would choose to have a regionally equal Senate, that is, it would be consisting of regions, the ones that we normally define, but also a special, what I would call northern and aboriginal region. This would be a political myth—but then again, ours is a nation full of political myths—in which we would say, "There is a region with 24 senators and they are aboriginal." The appointments of this would be on the basis of the votes—yes, going back to recommendation number 2, the aboriginal ballot, how those individuals voted. The seats would be allocated by

whatever body: a political party if the native groups chose; I would move for the first nations.

The idea here is that you provide for a Senate which is regional and is equal and has legitimacy through having a democratic mandate, but a democratic mandate which is not identical to that of the lower House. For if you have an identical mandate, you lead to an inevitable conflict between two Houses with the same constituency. By having a directly elected lower House and an indirectly elected upper House, you give both Houses legitimacy by being democratically accountable, but you do not build into your system the conflicts of the American system; nor, for that matter, by tying it slavishly to parties do you build into the system the difficulties as faced in Australia, where they have a proportional representation system.

2320

I would also put forth the notion that this Senate should be elected at the same time as the lower House. In terms of its functioning—and I will try to make this very quick—

The Chair: Be very brief, Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson: In terms of its functioning, I would look for double majorities: Aboriginal issues require a majority of the aboriginal senators and majority of everybody else; linguistic issues, the majority of the French, the majority of the English.

I have outlined other concerns, but to raise them very quickly, I think we need a constitutional court separate from the Supreme Court of Canada. We need an amending formula more in line with that of the Victoria Charter. We also need, I think, to give some meaning to mixed government by giving some power and legitimacy to our Lieutenant Governors and our Governor General. I would have this brought about by a means whereby these appointments would be made and ratified by two thirds of the legislatures in the case of the provinces and by a vote in the Senate and the House of Commons.

In this way we give meaning to these appointments so that we can indeed attempt—I emphasize attempt—to give some meaning to responsible government and try to return somewhat to our heritage, which is that of mixed government.

I have outlined fully the proposals. They are in the brief, and somebody might read them and pass them along. Thank you for your time, especially given the hour.

The Chair: Thank you.

BOZENA KOLAR EISENHAUER

The Chair: Our final speaker, Bozena Kolar Eisenhauer.

Ms Kolar Eisenhauer: Thank you very much. I am glad you did not forget me. I would like to thank all of you for staying so late. I brought this along not to wake you up, but to make sure I get my full five minutes.

The Chair: Oh, you will.

Ms Kolar Eisenhauer: I need to tell you a little about myself before we go too far. My first language is not English. My first language is Polish. My name is Bozena; it means "child of God." My mom and dad were refugees after the war in England, and that is where I was born. I have been

in Canada since I was 13 years old. I left on my 13th birthday and I have been preparing for this day for the last 21 years. This is the most important thing I have ever done in my life, and I have done a lot of important things. I have two teenage daughters, 17 and 16, and I spent the last 17 years of my life running a business out of my home after leaving law school, because I could not be supermom. I could not go to law school and raise my kids and do a hundred other things.

I am like every other Canadian in this country. I am very ordinary, and I am just that little bit extraordinary, just that little bit extraspecial. I think Canadians are that way always, for two reasons. One of them—I am going to get emotional; this is very emotional for me—is that we hold a set of values that are so strong and so clear and so Canadian. We do not talk about them very often, but it binds us together from sea to sea, and as my friend Jasper said to me in the hall—how did he put it?—from the Atlantic to the Pacific and to the Arctic. I am going to talk to you about that vision, but it is not vision.

Since I have come to Canada, I talk too much but I listen a lot. I listen to people on buses. I was raised in a small farming town called Killem, Alberta, where the welcome sign reads, "Drive carefully, Killem." I have been in Ontario 18 months; I am a new Ontarian. I am a westerner and you will never take the prairie out of the girl, ever, but I love this country and I love Quebec. Jasper has been helping me now; I just met him this evening when I listened—I wrote in French, from my grade 10, 11 and 12 high-school French, where we had books in which the most useful thing we learned was "Mon cousin est dans la marine." I tried to write in French what this country meant to me, and he helped me translate some of it. It should take two minutes, guys, so bear with me.

The other reason we are all special is that I have never talked to anybody I can remember from whom I did not learn something. We are all experts somewhere on something. I do not have all the answers and neither do any of you. I have been watching your faces and you are all really tired, but I see something else. I see two things, I think. I hope and I pray. One thing I see is a sense of respect for the wisdom you are hearing. I sometimes see disagreement; I sometimes see annoyance, but I do see that sense of respect. I can see it in your eyes. I think you are listening. I think Canadians all across this country, here in this province and across this country, are going to be telling us something really important in the next few weeks before 1 July.

Last Friday, I phoned up the Spicer commission and said, "Look, guys, I have to talk to you." They said okay and they phoned me back and said: "We are doing a forum at the Westin. Keith Spicer is going to be there, and Jean Lapierre. We have invited 10 other Canadians. Can you come?" This is Thursday afternoon. The forum was 8:30 in the morning until 2:30 in the afternoon.

Can you do that anywhere else in the world? I do not know. But you can sure do it in my country. I am nobody special. I am as special and as ordinary as the rest of us. We talked about my country and we laughed and we cried and we got angry with each other. There were people there who spoke in French. Pierre from Montreal has been here just

for a few years in Toronto. He works here. He says: "Everybody eventually comes to Toronto. This is where Canada must be."

Keith told us we were afraid, and we came there and I said to him, "I am here with great hope and I am here with great fear," and I am the same way before you tonight. We said: "What are you hearing across the country? We are scared. Is Quebec going? Are they leaving now?" and he said: "You know what I am hearing? I am hearing that there are two Canadas. There is a real Canada, the people, and there is a political Canada, and the two are entirely out of sync."

He said: "The people across the whole country are telling us the same thing. They are telling us this in the north, they are telling us this in the prisons, they are telling us this in Quebec, for God's sake. They are saying: 'We want one country, but we need a new deal, folks. We want the politicians to listen to what we are saying. We think we know what is best for our country.'" Canada is made up of 26 million Canadians who are experts on lots of different issues.

I very much hope and pray that one day I will be a politician. I want to do that because I believe that politics is the job of leading from behind. It is the job of listening and it is the job of responding and making mistakes and saying, "Is that what you really meant? This is what I think is good," laying it out honestly and then going back and checking.

I think that is what you are doing here. I think in this exercise in this committee what we are seeing is the rise across our country of—what can I call it? I do not know, but the word came to me tonight—a unity government. That is what I see the people forging here in a real democracy. We have not worked out the details yet, but we are working on it.

Last Friday—it is not my idea, but it was a word that came up—someone said, "We are looking at a re-Confederation in this country." Everything is on the table. I believe in my heart of hearts in a strong, central government. We need somebody in charge that looks after the poor, that looks after the homeless. We need someone to stand for justice and for strength and for peace and for economic fairness and we need a financial watchdog, and that is the federal government. I do not want to get into division of powers. Let's work it out.

All I am saying to you is that it is workable. This is not some ranting of an idealist. Sure, I am an idealist, but I also worked for Peter Lougheed as a legislative intern and I worked for the Leader of the Opposition and I understand some of the games. I wrote hard news for the Edmonton Journal and I am a businesswoman who still has her business in Calgary. I raise funds for the Family Service Association here in Ontario and I try to stay sane and put together a happy family.

I would like to talk for a minute in French, if you can indulge me, and I do not think it will take too much longer. I see my time is running out. Jasper and I got through half of it—

The Chair: You have a good clock. It is a little slower than mine but—

Ms Kolar Eisenhauer: I think it keeps terrific time, ladies and gentlemen, don't you?

The Chair: It is a Canadian clock; it is on Alberta time.

Ms Kolar Eisenhauer: It is on Alberta time. Thank you. This I am going to have to read because I am struggling.

Je ne parle pas bien français, j'ai étudié du français à l'école, en dixième, onzième et douzième année en Alberta, mais je voudrais que vous m'écoutez parce que je pense que j'ai un message très important pour tous les citoyens de mon pays. Je suis une Canadienne. Je suis née en Angleterre. Mes parents sont des réfugiés. Ils sont arrivés ici, après la Deuxième Guerre, de Pologne. Ma famille n'est pas riche. Ils ont travaillé très fort. Le Canada, c'est ma première home. I do not know how to say it in French. It was my first home, my only home.

Notre famille a décidé de venir ici parce que nous savions dans notre coeur, dans notre brain et dans notre soul qu'ici nous trouverions l'opportunité, que le Canada est une vraie démocratie. When we have problems, tous les citoyens, notre gouvernement nous écoute. Vous nous écoutez.

J'ai deux filles et de temps en temps je suis très malheureuse avec ces filles, mais parce que nous sommes une famille, parce que nous sommes différents, parce que nous les aimons, nous discutons. Avec une famille, avec la grande famille canadienne, nous avons des choix. Mais j'ai écouté tous les choix et que tous les autres Canadiens m'ont dit et vous ont dit. Et je request que vous écoutez très bien, okay?

I will not talk too much more, just finish up and say two things. I wanted to read every word of Gordon Lightfoot's Canadian Railroad Trilogy, which is fantastic and really sums up right now—I played it five times before I got here, guys, and I have every word written down—our future and our past and our dream.

What I want to ask of you is this: I want Canada to speak up and speak out now. We came up with the idea last Friday of asking all Canadians to do this, and we are going to be in Canadian Living magazine because it is the one that sponsored it. There are 2.4 million Canadian households that that magazine is going to, and this idea is going to be in it. We are really afraid that the politicians, you, the Spicer commission and all the other commissions across this country will not listen, and the hard work you have done will sit on a shelf somewhere and it will gather dust. This is way too important for that.

What we are going to ask is that on Canada Day, which is the day that that report is supposed to come down—I am not sure, my regrets, that I know when yours is coming down—all Canadians that care about this country go over to their local government office—I do not care if it is your local coffee shop, I do not care if it is Queen's Park, I do not care if it is Vegreville town hall at noon on Canada Day, because we cannot all come to Ottawa and we cannot all come here.

We are all going to go there at noon, and I do not care what we do. We can sing O Canada, some people are going to read poems, some are going to take art, do banners, whatever, and we are going to say: "Although we are coming back tonight to set off the fireworks, this means

we have told you the best way we know how that we want to work it out and we have told you we love Quebec just like we love Alberta," even though sometimes, as Laurier said to me, "Albertans are a pain in the ass," and he was talking about us specifically.

We want you to listen, because that wisdom will keep us strong in our country and in the world and, by God, we need each other and this world needs us.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Eisenhower. I think speak on behalf of the committee in saying that I am glad we have extended the time. Thank you very much.

I think that concludes this day of hearings for us here in Toronto. We are recessed until 9 o'clock tomorrow.

The committee adjourned at 2335.

EVENING SITTING

The committee, in part, resumed at 1911 in committee room 1.

The Vice-Chair: I would like to welcome you to our hearings today in Toronto, the second part. We have a long list of presenters. We are going to allow people five minutes to make presentations. We realize it is a little bit hard at times, but we want to allow as many people as possible to come together. The other thing is that we are going to refrain from questions from the committee in order to not use up too much of the time and allow more people to present.

What we are going to do, we will go five minutes, try not to do too many questions. We will get under way. So people understand out there what we have done tonight is that we have split the committee up into two parts. The reason that we split the committee into two parts is to allow more people again to present. If we would have been in a position of having the whole committee here, there would have been a lot of people left off the list. We realize at the end of the day there are still people who will not have a chance to present, but we ask you to submit your brief and to bring it before us and we will go through it.

PAUL PAKEMAN

The Vice-Chair: With that, we would like to ask for the first presenter, Paul Pakeman.

Mr Pakeman: I will stand for this. My name is Paul Pakeman, and I am here to let you know about my deep convictions about Canada. I want to talk to you specifically about federalism, and in order to have the language to be able to explain to you, I am coming from a perspective called earned capacity.

The Vice-Chair: We would ask the presenters to sit. It will not be picked up over the mikes otherwise.

Mr Pakeman: Okay. What I would like to focus on, through the perspective that I am coming from that offers me the language, is earned capacity. First of all, I would like to be very clear that for me federalism is failing Canada. It is disintegrating in front of my eyes. It is crumbling. The question is, why? I am referring specifically to its operations, its structures and practices. In fact, I am saying that it is outdated.

If we go back to historical texts for development of western economies, we find that the very premises and fundamental assertions for economies were built back in the 1700s and 1800s. Let me ask you this: Do you think a business would be in business today if it was using outdated operations and procedures? No. Federalism was built on the premise, back in the 1900s, that the economy and economics were the foundation for social development. Adam Smith, who was to me the father of economics with *The Wealth of Nations*, came by and said that it is the economy that allows people, in their own self-interest, to amass their wealth and embrace materialism. In those days they did not have the modern issues that we have been facing today.

Democratic governments like Canada were built on being able to support an economic infrastructure that primarily had a focus on preserving the economy. It has no basis for looking at environmental or social issues. If we start to talk about the social fabric and environmental fabric of Canada, back in the 1900s that was not an issue. We did not have the information back then, so the structure and operation and practices of our federal government were built around sustaining economies, not around looking at environmental and social issues. That is a modern concern. It cannot handle the stresses of those concerns when we start to look at those particular factors. It needs updating.

I cannot talk about the vision for Canada and identity for Canada and talk about our cultural and linguistic variances that we have in Canada and talk about how to achieve it if I do not have the federal capacity to be able to achieve those. We need the operation and practices in order to do that.

Let me give you an example of how well we have weighted, supported economic infrastructure. We have thermostatic mechanisms that can balance the economy. If it gets too hot, we can turn it down and if it gets too cold, we can turn it up. But can we do that with environmental and social issues? Do we have something like the central Bank of Canada or some mechanisms to start to balance the social and environmental fabric? No, we do not.

That is one of the biggest dissonances that I see. No wonder we have the cultural and national crisis that we do. Our present structure was not made to handle that. From the earned capacity perspective that I am coming from, both environmental and social need to be integrated into the economic infrastructure. It has to be united. How can you have and talk about a united Canada without having those things integrated into the economic infrastructure? Only in that way, for me, can we start to address the social issues, cultural issues, national issues that affect Canadians today. We cannot have it on the sideline any more.

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to sum up. You have about a minute left.

Mr Pakeman: For me, I think it is possible. There is a policy framework and an instrument framework and earned capacity that allow the integration of social and environmental factors into the economy—we do not have it today—that allow for thermostatic balancing mechanisms that can balance it on a daily, weekly or monthly basis, just like we do with money supply in Canada. Only in that way can I see a forging of unity in Canada when we start to look at how we are going to address our goals, because that will change our operation, structure and practices in how to achieve a healthy and whole Canada.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

MICHAEL McCUTCHEON

The Vice-Chair: The next one is Michael McCutcheon. The clerk is coming out presently with the list, so people can check where they are on it.

Mr McCutcheon: My name is Michael McCutcheon. I am a businessman here in Toronto. I am a Canadian and I am very, very concerned about my country. I am concerned about my country because it is going away and it is going away not because of bilingualism, multiculturalism, immigration policies; it is going away because of a thing called party-line vote. Party-line vote is destroying my country. We have to remember that it is party-line vote that created Bill 8. It is party-line vote that changed the multicultural makeup of this country. It is party-line vote that does the immigration policy of this country. It is party-line vote right across the line.

We supposedly in this country elect free men and free women to go to a free Parliament or free Legislature, but the problem is that once they get there, they may walk in free, but that freedom stops immediately with the party whip system. You people here are not allowed by your parties to represent your people, your constituents. You are not allowed to. You must be like a puppet bouncing up and down with the vote every time, like a clapping seal for the leader. It is absolutely ridiculous.

There is no consultation therefore. The power comes from the top down, not from the bottom, the people, up. Basically right now it is coming from the Prime Minister's office or the Premier's office, thundering down through the caucus, and then it becomes law on the floor of the Legislature or the House of Commons. This is what we have in Canada, my friends. We have a constitutional dictatorship and that is the major problem, over all others, facing this country. The party line has to be broken.

1920

Now there are many ways of breaking it. The first way of breaking it is to set up a fixed term of government of four years, or consider this—and this is, by the way, the Confederation of Regions idea—if you are voted out of power. You can be voted out by a motion of non-confidence at any time during that four years. Also, institute at the two-year and four-year periods binding referenda. You must act on it. You people here must act on the voice of the people.

The votes in Parliament have got to be free for you to do your job properly and represent the people. We have got to establish a democracy both provincially and federally. We have a lot of problems, friends, major problems, but if the party-line control continues in this country, forget it.

There are several other things that we can do. We can first of all put in a recall system of parliamentarians. If my representative is not doing a good job for me and is widely voting party line, the same way all of you people do right now, I want to be able to sign a petition and fire him and have a by-election and find some person who wants to represent me and not the party.

As I mentioned before, people go down to Ottawa, people come here to Queen's Park to represent the people, but they do not represent the people. They represent their parties. This has to be stopped or we go right down the drain provincially and federally.

Forget about Quebec, forget about the whole shot. Therein lies the problem that you people are studying supposedly. But again, you are going to be reporting back to

your party bosses and they are going to make another dictum coming down. It has to be broken somewhere. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr McCutcheon: I have this book. I have 10 copies of it. I cannot get 38. It is Ken McDonald's *Keeping Canada Together*. I would like to give this to you for distribution to the select committee.

The Vice-Chair: You can leave it with the clerk of the committee.

I would ask people to try to keep to the five minutes because what is going to happen, we will end up going over and losing time for other presenters. Okay? Thank you.

Mr McCutcheon: Excuse me, I have 40 seconds going. If these people want to clap, they can damned well clap.

[Applause]

The Vice-Chair: Very good. Thank you very much.

ROBERT E. WRIGHT

The Vice-Chair: The next presenter is R. E. Wright.

Mr Wright: Thank you. You set forth a number of questions for discussion and I would like to address them in the order in which you put them forward. I am referring to your brochure *Changing for the Better*.

1. "What are the values we share as Canadians?" We along with the Swedes and the Swiss, are among the most governable of peoples in the world, and this implies a governmental obligation to treat us with consideration. We are potential doormats and could be and have been or occasion overgoverned. We have been and can be offended. We are offended by arrogance. We value humility especially when it is found along with informed intelligence.

2. "How can we secure our future in the international community?" First, we must keep the respect we have in the international community. This ties in with your first question. We are respected for our values, even if we are questioned on our success in their implementation. Where we fall down, I am afraid, is trying to be something we are not, rather than practising what we can do best. Yes, use our natural resources, especially those that are renewable but set aside a part of that income to make Canada a centre for research and development. We can then license and receive royalties from production of new products by others which we cannot do profitably because of our limited market. Our future in the international community will be secured by our ability to do the very best with what we have, which is considerable.

3. "What role should the federal and provincial governments play?" I want the federal government to protect me and my rights and privileges only where a national body can both rationally and cost-effectively do the job. This means as a minimum national defence, setting of national standards, a Supreme Court, national monetary policy. Of this, I see national standards as of the greatest significance. We Canadians increasingly value mobility, and I would be restricted in my choices of residence if I could not enjoy the painless transfer of my lifestyle, including medical

are, the legal system, my electrical appliances, my financial assets, etc.

You will note I said the federal government should be responsible only for the setting of standards. I do not think it is their function to police these standards nor to manage them nor to administer them except as a court of last resort, the Supreme Court. I similarly want the provincial government to protect me and my rights and privileges only where a provincial body can both rationally and cost-effectively do that job.

4. "How do we achieve justice for Canada's original peoples?" Certainly treaty rights and land claims must be settled. It would be my suggestion that for the time being such claims be given high government priority, starting at the local levels, which would represent such claims at the provincial levels, which would in turn represent such claims at the federal level.

We should set time limits for settlement. One of the objections of any such settlement would clearly be the elimination of the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. For all claims to be settled, we must also recognize the validity of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories as having provincial status and that first peoples' political borders be theirs to negotiate. Land rights should be inviolate and inheritable without taxation.

5. "What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada?" No more and no less than the roles of any other language in Canada. If we take the example that any Canadian citizen deserves the right to be communicated with in his own tongue, including American sign language, Inuit, Spanish, Portuguese, etc., in any matters of governmental significance, it is incumbent to provide services in a minimum of the two founding languages wherever appropriate and neither should be allowed to be banned in any way and in any location. Language is, however, only the tip of the cultural iceberg and we should be concentrating more on cultural accommodation than on strictly linguistic matters. I refer to 6 below.

6. "What is Quebec's future in Canada?" Ontario has a function to perform in the process of what I might call accommodation. I see it as selling Canada to Quebec. I do not think the French see the value of being Canadian as I see it, and I think that is a pity. But we are not going to get anywhere being anti-anything unless we have a better mousetrap to offer. I think we can produce one. We already have the guts of it in Ontario.

7. "What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic regions?" Back to point 3. If the local governments are given and assume more autonomy through the management and control of local issues, supported by their right to be the only tax collector, then their place would be assured and the question goes away.

8. "What does Ontario want?" Perhaps just to be the nation-state we are. We have embarked on a number of programs to improve our lifestyle, among which your committee is not the least. It has made us think. It has roused us out of our apathy—who cares?—and we have been given a real opportunity to make our lives and our country better than otherwise might have been the case.

The Vice-Chair: May I ask you to sum up.

Mr Wright: Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: You are quite welcome.

We would ask that anybody who is not on the list go and see the clerk in the back of the hall to make sure your name is on, and if it is not on, to try to get it inserted at the end of it.

Mr Wright: This is a much longer paper and I have 10 copies here.

The Vice-Chair: Yes. Could you leave it with the clerk? She will pick it up on the way through. Thank you.

1930

DAVID MURRAY

The Vice-Chair: Next on the agenda is David Murray.

Mr Murray: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, thank you very much for the invitation to appear before you. We have waited, many of us, for 30 or more years to say these things.

In 1867 Confederation, as we know it, was an appropriate response to the post-Civil War threat of manifest destiny from the United States and the requirement to tidy up British colonial possessions in North America. However, it was never an entirely harmonious union, especially between Quebec and the English-language provinces of Canada. After a period of quietude immediately after Confederation, Quebec nationalism awoke, encouraged by the risings of Henri Bourassa and others, and it never went to sleep again.

Rather, and since the 1960s particularly, Quebec nationalism has become increasingly strident, demanding and catered to. In the very recent past, Quebec's claims to particularity have been at the price of a strong central government and have been matched by the central government's willingness to devolve to all provinces the particularity Quebec as a nation claims for itself.

Not surprisingly, the French-speaking people of Quebec can rightly claim to be a nation of their own. Why? Because 82% of them can claim to be bonded by two, if not three, of the three unifying elements of a nation, namely, race, religion and language. Present-day Canada is bonded by none of the three. Rather it is separated and made more brittle by two of them, namely, race and language.

It is therefore time, after 125 years of the noble experiment of Confederation to say, "It ain't gonna work the way it was designed." It is time to let the Quebec nation have its own space, just as we applaud that Ireland, Poland, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Norway, Finland, etc., have won or are winning their own space in this century.

In 1867, when Canada's Confederation was founded, all of those aforementioned states were parts of larger political states, just as Quebec is now. They have survived or will survive just as an independent Quebec will survive. But what of Anglo-Canada, and particularly Ontario, after Quebec leaves the Confederation that was created 125 years ago? Anglo-Canada and Ontario will also survive because they will be unified by race and language, but not religion, since all shall continue to subscribe to religious freedom and tolerance.

We shall have the bonds of the English language and the Canadian race that is made up of many, many, many original strains: an Anglo-Canadian race of many original strains, just as there is an Anglo-American race of many original strains. This may sound radical to you, but it is not. There is as much of an Anglo-Canadian nation as there is of an American nation, which is also bonded by the English language and many original racial strains.

Let us dismiss immediately one fear of what would happen when, and not if, Quebec separates. The present Atlantic provinces would also survive as parts of Anglo-Canada. Their roots of history run too deep even to contemplate independence or absorption by the United States, even supposing the US would admit them. By the way, Mr Chairman, I say this as a former Nova Scotian before I became an Ontarian.

Atlantic Canada, though separated by an independent Quebec from the mainland of Canada, namely, Ontario and the west, would be just as united to that Anglo-Canada as are Alaska and Hawaii united to the mainland United States, as is Northern Ireland united to the mainland of Great Britain or as was East Prussia united to the mainland of Germany before 1939. There are many other examples to prove that it is not necessary for united countries or bonded nations to be contiguous.

To conclude, Mr Chairman, I offer you the following recommended elements for a post-1992 Anglo-Canada, with Ontario as the leader of it.

We should stop multiculturalism; it is divisive. Instead we should strengthen Anglo-Canadianism along the lines of the American melting pot.

We should provide for a strong central government. We should stop the pious, pompous, provincial, princeling premiers from presuming that they are anything more than the administrators of local matters.

We should adopt the triple E Senate.

We should amalgamate provinces in the interests of economy of scale, and by the way, this is not an original idea from myself. It was originally propounded by Premier W. A. C. Bennett of British Columbia about 25 years ago. It is absurd that the provincial Premier should have veto rights over the future of Canada's Constitution.

To make the two previous recommendations work, namely, a triple E Senate and amalgamated provinces, we recommend that Newfoundland, which is a distinct society, should have 7 senators; a united Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, 21; Ontario, 21; a united Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 21; a united British Columbia and Yukon, 21, for a total of 91 senators.

We should entrench referenda to give more freedom to the individuals, as the previous speaker indicated.

Finally, we should stop the duplication between the central and the provincial governments in areas such as agriculture, communications and foreign affairs. We do not need a CBC and a TVO. We do not need Ontario agents general and high commissioners in London and Ontario agents general and ambassadors in Bonn and Paris.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr Murray: Thank you, Mr Chairman, for your attention. Extra copies are available.

JOHN POPE

The Vice-Chair: I call John Pope next.

Mr Pope: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, immersed in the mess this country finds itself in is one common denominator among English-speaking Canadians, and that is ignorance: ignorance of our history, ignorance of the legitimate claims and aspirations of Quebec and ignorance of the minefields ahead. Clearly we are a nation, but we do not know where we are, we do not know where we are going and we do not know what to do when we get there.

Concerning Quebec, I do believe, after reading the history of my country, that it has both a legal and a moral claim to sovereignty. I could mention the years 1764 and 1791 and they would mean nothing to most people here, but I could say that from 1841 to 1848 the promises made to the French Canadians were broken and French no longer had official status. This was changed finally in 1848 by Macdonald and Taché. But the real crime, I believe, was committed in 1890 in the fourth session of the sixth Parliament of Canada when, in effect, an amendment to the Northwest Territories Act deprived French-speaking people of their rights there. Section 93 of the BNA Act was broken.

1940

I do believe that bilingualism and biculturalism, as practised and administered in this country, which were originally intended to promote unity, have had the opposite effect.

This crisis we are in means opportunity for a new beginning, a Constitution with built-in financial disciplines, a streamlined bureaucracy and decentralized legislative powers. Aboriginal and a host of other rights cannot be solved by the Constitution or it will take a hundred and a thousand years, if ever, to be adopted.

The key to a peaceful, just and successful implementation of Quebec's aspirations and the survival of a prosperous Canada can be found in the position of the crown. That does not mean loyalty to the inhabitants of Buckingham Palace; instead it provides the legal and peaceful solution to ancient land claims, cases in chancery, government debt, obligation, treaties and many facets of daily life. The reckless abandonment of this cornerstone would bring hardship and chaos to everyone.

For example, in Ireland, De Valera detested, hated the British and took his country out of the Commonwealth and made it a republic. Yet he found he could not do away with the crown simply because the Irish people would suffer hardships due to many legalities, and it was not until after the Second World War that finally the Queen as the head of state was abolished. So I can see that Quebec, if it goes its separate way, will go its separate way together with the rest of us due to the position of the crown, and this really means that we have to work together.

I see a Constitution with elastic bands, and this was the original BNA Act. For example, Manitoba had treaties international accords with the state of Minnesota. Manitoba did not have to apply to Ottawa for permission; Minnesota did have to get presidential approval. In Ontario, in 1941, a

treaty was concluded with Bermuda on educational matters and 300 teachers came up here, but when Quebec wanted to do the same thing with the francophone nations of the world, Pierre Trudeau said no. We have developed into a centralized state and we need to be decentralized.

There are two universal principles of government, whether it is Liberal or Conservative or Socialist or Communist or the government of a tyrant. These are, one, the protection of the nation and, two, the protection of the family and individual, to protect the family, the individual from the greed of any capitalistic corporation, from the power of any labour union and from the tyranny of any government department.

Following these two basic principles are two great leaders of the past, Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who brought this country to the zenith of its beauty.

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to sum up, sir.

Mr Pope: Right.

The Vice-Chair: You still have a minute. I was just asking you to sum up.

Mr Pope: These two principles will have to be faced by both Quebec and the other regions of Canada in the future. This will require a radical departure from the way we look at this. Very briefly, in days gone by, our railways, roadways, canals, all our methods of transportation were part of our system of national defence, and I believe that in the sovereignty situation, we should consider our past and go back to basics.

I thank you very much for the privilege of speaking to you. I hope that you, as representatives of this province, will show a strong measure of realism, integrity, tolerance, sensitivity and, above all, something that is lacking in public life today, i.e., sound scholarship, when you meet with your friends from Quebec.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

MARY ANNE ATELL

The Vice-Chair: Next on the list is Mary Anne Atell.

Ms Atell: I feel values shared as Canadians are freedom, multiculturalism, bilingualism, the health plan, and as Canadians we all strive for a better standard of living, better educational standards and a peaceful nation. We are all immigrants to this land of opportunity, with the exception of the natives and Inuits.

To me, the holding force of Canada in the past was the belief that people had in a new world, a new life where they were no longer going to be oppressed by the government the way that they had left behind in the old country, where the rich were getting richer, the poor were getting poorer, so they created a middle class.

Now the government's ways seem to have caught up with us. The rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer and the government is not listening to us, its people, people who are the driving force of Canada. We are what makes the country tick and we have been pulling up our own socks, and Mulroney still says Canada has to pull up its socks. Well, Mulroney has to pull up his socks. He

should stop giving himself salary increases, as well as the members of Parliament.

When the government does not listen to its people, that is when the country breaks down, and Mulroney's government is tearing the country apart, taking away people's lands, fisheries, farms, businesses. This must stop. We do not want to become the 51st state.

The force on which to build a common wealth is to keep the people together in the 21st century as proud Canadians, to give farmers back their lands and the fisheries back to the fishermen and to give the businesses back to the people who are losing them at an alarming rate. Get back our resources. A strong nation is a strong economy. All the regions would benefit from this.

We would not and do not need any uranium mining in Saskatchewan for nuclear weapons and radioactive waste, which is environmentally hazardous. We need farms in Saskatchewan, which have been abandoned due to this government's misuse of power.

The values that bind us together as Canadians are that we are a multicultural, peace-loving nation, and we are a nation rich in resources to develop, rather than selling out to the country below the border.

We believe in freedom of the people and the quality of being free in this country, Canada, the independence to choose our own path. I believe in democracy, but is it democracy that I see in this country? Democracy in the dictionary means "a government in which the supreme power is held by the people." I do not see that happening in this country. Otherwise, Mulroney would not be here any more; he would be gone.

In that we accept things as they come and are a passive nation, I am starting to see a change, such as today's discussion, and I hope our views will be used.

Our multicultural fabric in this society is unique and the major attraction in Canada, well received by Canadians and precious. I feel the Canadian monarchy is long overdue and should work for a better Canada. As for the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, are all the rights and freedoms protected? Does the unborn baby have rights? Does a child have rights? Does a woman have rights?

Equality rights must be upheld. Native rights should be put into effect. I am embarrassed to be a Canadian when I see native Canadians treated so poorly. Shelter, food and clothing should be a legal right. For the physically and mentally abused, proper therapy should be covered by the health plan for all ages, especially children.

The Canadian way of life would be a lot more pleasant if the relationship between the government and the people were better, rather than a dictatorship. It is very important that the Charter of Rights applies in all respects across the country. We should pay attention to what we have, to know and to keep what we have.

Our common belief is that we have a wonderful country where freedom is very precious. We have our own identity as Canadians and we have built this into a beautiful country which our parents worked hard for and we do not want anyone to take it away from us.

Canada is rich in resources and our multiculturalism has taught us a lot as we have learned from it. We have

learned similarities within our differences. For example, everyone has a different religion but a similar Creator. There are different cultures that have similarities in their foods and clothes and music, arts and dance and crafts, similarities as human beings.

To manage our economy is to serve people's needs better, to gather all our resources and start building a new Canada, new ways of approaching these hard economic times. I believe Canada can come back greater and even better than before with our knowledge of positive, productive, environmentally friendly ways to produce energy, foods, clothing, etc, on all levels.

We all know it is there and it has to be done to save this planet. We all breathe the same air, we drink the same water. So let's start doing it. All Canadians want a better life as well as providing the best they can for their children, physically, mentally and spiritually.

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to sum up. You are running a little bit past your time.

1950

Ms Atell: I would like to say here that the Inuit people should have their rights given back. The rights of the people of Canada should be given back, what has been taken away from them. The Constitution should apply when it comes to Quebec. French and English language is a wonderful thing to have in our country and it should be applied to every corner of Canada.

The regional identity should be expressed by the people by electing a regional body of specialists in the field, and they should all come together annually so that they can have regional representatives to solve the issues and the concerns, come together so we would know what the issues are in that particular part of this country of Canada. We would like to have more people come together so our standard of living can get higher. We do not need the GST and the war and all these things that add up to something that is not going to do anything better for Canada, but going to make it worse. We have to get it together, and the politicians should get the trust of the people by really solving concerns of the people: women's issues, native issues and cultural issues. Canada will be an inspiration to other countries in how it can be done. Let's do it all together now for the children of the world.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

PHILIP WALKER

The Vice-Chair: Philip Walke; next will be Martin Drover.

Mr Walke: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Philip Walke is my name. I am here as a concerned Canadian, and the theme of my presentation is the need for a strong central government. I am optimistic about the future, and I have not counted anybody out. I am sure we can solve our problems and still remain 10 provinces and two territories as we always have been.

National unity with a purpose—this was a phrase often spoken by the late Lester B. Pearson during the 1960s when Dominion provincial conferences were held on a regular basis. What is the purpose of national unity? The

purpose should be defined as national unity for the common good of all Canadians. As one of the best, if not the best country in the world, Canada has achieved this purpose in the fields of health care, family allowances, old age security and Canada pension plan, etc. If we were not 20 million people under one umbrella as a nation, none of us would enjoy any of these benefits we have today, and if the country is allowed to disintegrate, then it will not be realistically or economically possible to continue providing these benefits.

Language rights: Canada is a country founded by two founding races, English and French, but it is a land first settled upon by native people of various backgrounds whose rights have to be both recognized and respected. Therefore, we are either Canadians by birth or we are Canadians by choice, and as such, one of the official languages should prevail, depending on what community we live in, regardless of what region of the country we happen to live in. In this, I am not looking at Quebec being unilingual in one language, or Ontario being bilingual in another language. I am looking at if you are English in Quebec you have a right to speak English in Quebec; if you are French in Ontario, you have the right to speak French in Ontario. A good example of this is our northern communities or Ottawa Valley communities where we do have French-speaking communities.

A person who is a Canadian by birth has a right to his or her language, and a Canadian by choice should accept the language of the community in which he happens to settle. Customs and traditions should prevail in the churches, homes and ethnic communities, thus playing down the fact of the multicultural society and putting more emphasis on being Canadians first. Ethnic customs and traditions can be displayed at festivals and functions such as the annual Caravan which is put on in Metropolitan Toronto. In this way, I think we all have a chance to join in and be part of the multicultural community and learn how other people live.

The Senate: The Senate has a place in governing this country. However, the role of the Senate should be redefined as to both what its original purpose was and should be. The Senate should be a body to protect the public against bad legislation and also to propose new legislation that is for the benefit of Canadians.

In the free trade and GST debates, those senators who opposed this legislation were speaking for the majority of Canadians, who in the 1988 election voted against the government on the basis of the percentage of the vote cast, and therefore did not give the government a mandate to legislate these measures. It seems ironic when one looks at the criticism which was shown to those senators who opposed these measures for supposedly going against the will of the people, when on the other hand there was hardly a worse spoken when a tie vote defeated the abortion legislation.

The members of the Senate should continue to be appointed by the governing party of the federal government but only on a non-partisan basis; they should be appointed on the merits of ability and knowledge to do the job.

An example of outstanding people in this country to emulate are Senator Joseph Croll for his concerns on issues

f poverty and Justice Hall for his work in areas of health care. Other people who displayed wisdom for the good of the country are the late senators Gratton O'Leary and Eugene Forsey.

There have been times in past history when prime ministers have seen fit to appoint people from other parties rather than being partisan and just appointing their own party members. Perhaps a Senate appointment should be for a specified term rather than a lifetime appointment, with provisions for reappointments until a given age, when retirement would be mandatory.

In conclusion, during the Meech Lake debate I took umbrage with those people, both in the media and in a position in government, for stating that those of us who opposed Meech Lake were against Quebec. I opposed Meech Lake for the reason that it gave too much power to all the provinces, thus weakening the central government. I have lived in Ontario all my life, but I class myself as Canadian first, and I respect and support the people of Quebec in the same manner as I do the people of the other nine provinces and the two northern territories.

All provincial governments, together with the two territories and representatives of aboriginal peoples, must negotiate with the federal government as to the future of this nation. The goals and visions for the future must be to provide government that can legislate matters pertaining to social justice. In looking ahead to the 21st century, changes in industry and society will be such that governments will have a greater role in the affairs of society if that society is to be a well-ordered society where all its citizens can live in the dignity which they deserve.

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to sum up, sir.

Mr Walke: To provide these goals, the answer is to establish and maintain a strong central government with proper regional administration of its programs. Such negotiations must be done without the use of any type of referendum vote, as the issue is too emotional and complex to leave to the ballot box as an issue of its own. The onus is on elected officials to be responsible for bringing this matter to a successful conclusion.

As a footnote, I reiterate the words of the late Senator Eugene Forsey:

"The only Canada I want to preserve is a Canada that can do something; for its own people, for the hungry two thirds of the world, for the survival of the planet; not a phantom that can only watch helplessly as we all tumble down a steep place to destruction."

Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.

The Vice-Chair: I thank you very much.

2000

MARTIN DROVER

The Vice-Chair: Martin Drover.

Mr Drover: I come here tonight as just a regular Canadian. I have never been involved in any political thing. I never voted until last September, when the NDP got in. The only reason I went to vote is because of the almighty dollar; as far as auto insurance goes, I cannot believe what they are saying in the private world of auto insurance.

Anyway, I am a little flustered because I have never done this before.

There are eight questions you are asking here. I have simple answers because I think they are simple questions. You may think I am just simple-minded the way I answer the questions, but that is the way I feel.

The first question is: What are values that we share as Canadians? I think first of all is life; second is language; third is culture.

The second question: How can we secure our future in an international economy? We have to deal with whatever the atmosphere of the economy is. I really do not know. Whatever we have to do to do it, then we have to do it.

What role should the federal and provincial government play? Federal government should play the role of Canada and the provincial government should play the role of the region.

How do we achieve justice for our aboriginal people of Canada? Basically, we give them what they want. We may not have the money to give it right away. I think they are sensible-minded enough to understand that we may not have all the money to give it instantaneously, but I think it is long overdue. I do not think we have any more excuses we can come up with to have another committee make a decision on what they should or should not get. I think they should get everything they ask for.

What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada? Being that they are English and French languages, I think they should both exist. I think we should have a bilingual country and I think the only way to really achieve it is through education and French immersion. I am part French, but I do not speak any. My niece is going to a French immersion school and she is slowly learning, and from her I am slowly regaining some of that cultural past.

What is Quebec's future in Canada? I do not think this is the question. I think the question is: What is the French people's future in Canada? I think their future should be that they should be able to coexist with us. I think we should ask the French people of Quebec, not the Quebec government, what they want; what they are afraid we are going to take away from them if they stay with us. But you cannot rightly blame them, in the political atmosphere that is around now. If I was given the choice as an Ontarian to stay or leave, I would choose leaving. I want nothing to do with Mr Mulroney. My hatred for the man is beyond any I have ever felt.

What is the place of the west and the north and the Atlantic region? I think this is a dumb question. I think it is where they lie. I do not see how we could make it any different. What do you expect us to do, pick them up and put them somewhere else?

What does Ontario want? I do not know what Ontario wants. I do not think the question is right. I think it should be: What does a Canadian want? I am really upset with everything that has been going on for the past few months, and a lot of it has to do with the federal government and the way it has acted towards me. They are more concerned with pleasing everybody else around the world than pleasing me as a Canadian, or pleasing Canada. They are worried about what other people think.

Mulroney, with his thing with the military, is trying to give a token force and make it feel like Canada is doing this big offensive manoeuvre for the rest of the world when we really cannot afford to offer that, and that is not the way I feel. I do not mind being in the Persian Gulf in a defensive position, defending and doing things like they were with stopping and checking boats; I can understand that. But to send Canadians into a situation where they could get killed fighting, and when we cannot really afford to provide that, our economic situation cannot afford that—

I just want Mr Rae to know that I stand behind him in whatever he does. I stand behind him as a person, not as a political leader. I do not look at him that way. I look at him in what I believe he is and what he represents to me. I do not always agree with everything the NDP does and stuff like that, but I agree with the man. I think he is a smart, sensible man. Whatever direction he wishes to take, if he follows his own heart, I think we could go somewhere big.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much. It was not too bad for your first time, was it?

Mr Drover: It was pretty nerve-wracking.

DANIEL GALASKI

The Vice-Chair: Daniel Galaski; after that will be Shalom Schachter.

Mr Galaski: Good evening, Mr Chairman and members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. I come before you today not as a member of any organization or group, but as an average, concerned Canadian, a Canadian who is at present filled with frustration, anger and resentment.

Before I continue I want to state that I was born and raised in Toronto. Over the years, I have had the opportunity to live in other Canadian cities, namely, Calgary, Vancouver and Montreal. I hope to visit the maritime provinces in the future in order to continue the discovery of my Canadian identity. A curious phrase, is it not? "To continue the discovery of my Canadian identity." What exactly does it mean?

For me, it is best defined as a process of evolution, not stagnation; having a national view instead of regional self-centredness; the acceptance and support of the aboriginal and francophone people's unique culture and language instead of assimilation; tolerance and understanding of the multicultural mosaic of this country instead of ignorance and fear; travelling this great country from sea to sea to sea so that we can build bonds of friendship and respect for one another instead of sitting in front of our TVs and allowing these bonds to be destroyed by the media and politicians.

This is one Canadian who has a serious credibility problem with the Canadian press, both French and English, and the political leaders in this country. In this information age, we Canadians certainly have an abundance of print and electronic media at our disposal. There is, however, a fine line between being informed and beating an issue to death. When the media overkills an issue, a phenomenon occurs in which people accept through resignation. A recent example is how the French press has vigorously stirred up the separatist sentiment in Quebec.

This, of course, if reflected in the latest polls emanating from that province.

The English press in Canada interprets the same information and paints a picture of Quebec's imminent departure. Are we, as Canadians, receiving responsible unbiased coverage of current events? Have we fallen prey to the media's insatiable thirst for sensationalism and the hype of an issue to satisfy their financial bottom lines? Are they in part responsible for the national unity crisis in this country? This is not for me to answer, nor to decide, but for all of us to consider as we seek a solution to the constitutional impasse facing this country.

In the past year the political leaders in Canada and in Quebec have shown contempt for their respective electorates. As long as I live I will never forget June 1990. I will never forget how the Prime Minister of Canada and the first ministers met behind closed doors to discuss our Constitution, the heart and soul, the very fabric of this nation and reduced those meetings to a crap shoot. What role did Canadians play in this constitutional process? We were delegated the role of "the ignorant masses." We, the ignorant masses, gathered on Parliament Hill and had to wait for almost a week before Moses Mulroney and his disciples came down off the mountain with their vision of a new Canada etched in stone.

Ah, yes, our illustrious Prime Minister. On one hand he espouses the virtues of a strong, prosperous, united Canada bolstered by our national institutions and powers of equality enshrined in our Constitution. On the other hand lies the remnant of Via Rail, CBC, Air Canada and Petro-Canada.

2010

In addition and more recently, is a bilateral deal relinquishing more federal immigration powers to Quebec. Will the provinces receive the same deal? The answer is a very simple no. And why? Again, the answer is simple. Mr Mulroney does not have the guts to challenge the separatists in Quebec, and I do not mean standing in the National Assembly presenting a speech filled with catchphrases from the past. Actions speak louder than words, Mr Mulroney. Coupled with the economic mess of this country and the void promises of the free trade agreement, your actions, Mr Mulroney, are telling me that it is time for you to resign.

When the Meech Lake agreement died, the English media in Canada told us that Mr Bourassa remained Canada's last hope for federalism in Quebec. With the release of the Allaire report, Mr Bourassa has finally shown his true separatist colours. This report clearly tells Canadians that this was, all along, Mr Bourassa's real definition of the "distinct society" clause contained within that now-defunct agreement. Elijah Harper and Clyde Wells were right in their opposition to the inconclusive definition of the "distinct society" clause as outlined in that agreement. I wonder why Mr Mulroney and Mr Bourassa were so adamant about not legally defining this clause until after Meech was signed.

Mr Parizeau is not now nor will he ever be a sovereigntist. Do not be fooled by his sovereigntist rhetoric. He is a separatist. Mr Parizeau and his separatist party have painted for their constituents a rose-coloured picture

f a separate Quebec. However, both he and Mr Bourassa insult the intelligence of the Quebec electorate by not denying the economic, cultural and social benefits of a separate Quebec.

We must be crystal-clear about this separatist agenda in Quebec. Simply stated, it is the creation of the nation-state of Quebec at any cost, even if it means the destruction of Canada as we know it today. The separatists almost achieved their goal last June, had the Meech Lake accord passed. The thrust of their achievement was contained within the ambiguous "distinct society" clause. Let's face it, a majority of Canadians did not understand the ramifications of that clause. Mr Mulroney and Mr Bourassa kept telling us that they would define that clause after Meech was ratified. We now have the true definition of the "distinct society" clause as outlined in the Allaire report. I intend that the Meech Lake ordeal represented nothing more than the mother of all deceptions of the Canadian electorate. Let us never forget who the key deceptors were: Mr Mulroney, the Prime Minister of Canada, the first ministers, Mr Bourassa and Mr Parizeau.

As a Canadian, I am so God-damned angry and resentful of the clowns we call political leaders in this country. The Prime Minister and the first ministers have, in the past year, redefined the new order of Canadian politics.

The Vice-Chair: Mr Galaski, I would ask you to sum up.

Mr Galaski: Okay. Instead of exhibiting qualities of leadership, responsibility, compassion, honesty and respect, they have chosen to replace these qualities with deception, manipulation, contempt for the Canadian electorate. Because of their actions, they have succeeded in dividing this country. I am ashamed at how the aboriginal peoples in this country have been treated. I am ashamed at the levels of intolerance and lack of respect that English, French and multicultural Canadians show for one another. I am ashamed that our politicians perceive Canadians as pawns on a chessboard to be moved and manipulated via the media for their own political games. I am ashamed at the finance ministers' and the Bay Street wizards,' "It's our problem, not mine," attitude directed at those who have lost their jobs as a result of the free trade agreement and recession.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am tired of being angry, I am tired of being frustrated, but above all I am tired of being ashamed for being a Canadian. In terms of Ontario's role in Confederation, there are recommendations at the back here, and I conclude.

LAWRENCE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY RIDING ASSOCIATION

The Vice-Chair: Shalom Schachter, and after that it will be Alain Pechon.

Mr Schachter: Good evening. I am here on behalf of the Lawrence New Democratic Party Riding Association. Lawrence riding is the southern and western portion of North York in Metropolitan Toronto and I was its candidate in the most recent provincial election.

Our membership felt it was important to discuss among ourselves and to participate in the public debate on

the future of our province, the future of our country. At the beginning of February we held an open public meeting in the riding. We had panellists Marilou McPhedran, a feminist lawyer, and Professor Leo Panitch from the political science department of York University lead the discussion. After that meeting we had a membership meeting to thrash out our views and then an executive meeting to put together these submissions.

This brief in point form summarizes the views expressed in our meeting. We follow the order of questions that is set out in the discussion paper put out by the government. As an introduction, though, perhaps you will turn from the cover page to the next page where it says "Preamble."

We believe the present timetable that was established for this information gathering is too compact, that if lasting outcomes are expected from this exercise, then more time must be allocated so that wide discussions can take place and we do not repeat one of the failures of the Meech Lake process.

We also believe that the reactive approach to constitutional change or the rush to be in step or ahead of Quebec is not conducive to constitutional change and we should avoid getting into having to follow deadlines that are set by other participants.

Finally we expect the committee to ensure that both in its process and in its outcomes, it reflects the needs of the majority group within this province, that being the women of Ontario.

The first question asked, as to the values that we share as Canadians, we expect that having identified values, they will be reflected in a vision statement of where this country should be going, and we expect that vision statement will then be developed and maintained through national institutions of transportation, communication and development.

We have identified some of the values that we believe are widely shared: first, that we are a multiracial, multicultural and multilingual community; second, that we recognize the importance of community through a shared concern for each member of the community; and finally, that we hold great importance in collective action for the betterment of the members of the community. At the end of these submissions, we will be making a proposal to facilitate that collective action.

You have our comments on question 2, our future in the international economy. At this point I want to go directly to question 3, the roles that should be played by the federal and provincial governments. We believe in the need for a strong central government, one that has the power to ensure that there are national standards for universal social services and to maintain a national economy. On that point I simply point out that if Quebec should stay within Canada, the federal government should have the power to ensure that these standards also apply in Quebec. Second, as part of Quebec's remaining in Canada, if that means that there is a special accommodation reached in giving Quebec certain powers, those powers should not be given to other provinces to ensure that there is a central government with effective powers.

Going on to the bottom point on the page in terms of the Constitution, as indicated at the beginning, we believe

that constitutional growth should not be reactive or a product of short-term crisis management, but should be a planned process.

Finally, perhaps most importantly, going on to the next page, the essence of a Constitution should not only be what powers a federal government should have and what powers a provincial government should have, but it should also deal with the question of how we govern ourselves. We have to make government more responsive to the members of the community. We have outlined a number of suggestions on that page. One of them, perhaps the most important one, is empowering citizens and community-based groups to participate in decision-making. Democracy should be more that electing a set of dictators every four or five years.

Going on to question 4, how we achieve justice for Canada's original people—

2020

The Vice-Chair: Mr Schachter, you have about a minute to go, so either go to your conclusion or make the most important points.

Mr Schachter: Thank you. We have indicated that we are a multicultural community. If any group has priority for its needs being addressed, it is our first Canadians, the native people. In regard to question 6, we want to indicate that if Quebec remains, the Charter of Rights should be applicable in Quebec. Question 7, we agree that there is a feeling of alienation for people outside Quebec and Ontario. That has to be addressed in our national structures, perhaps in a restructured, elected, effective Senate that will participate and be part of a national government with a mandate for action.

On page 6, under section 3, "Justice," we point out that our courts have to be more reflective of all elements of Canadian society. I indicated, one of the values that we believe exist in Canada is the value of collective action for the betterment of the community. The Charter of Rights should be amended to define and protect collective rights. One of those rights should be the rights of workers to unionize and bargain collectively and that should be enshrined in our Constitution.

Finally, we believe that political parties have a very important role in promoting competing vision statements. We expect that this new Ontario government will play a central role in the creation and promotion of a vision statement that all Ontarians and all Canadians can share and be proud of.

ALAIN PECHON

The Vice-Chair: Alain Pechon, and after that will be George Robert Shaw.

Mr Pechon: Tonight I am going to speak English with a French accent about the second question on page 16 of this document, very important, the question being, "How can we lessen the tension between Canada's two official language communities?"

This is an object. This object has two sides: a front side and a back side. On the back side the threads hang out and the pattern is not evident. On the front side the different

coloured threads form a harmonious, unified pattern. This object is a metaphor for the two official languages of Canada.

For the past 20 years, the Canadian authorities have shown the back side of bilingualism, so to speak. If you show the back side of bilingualism, you get tension between Canada's two official language communities. Here are two examples of that tension.

First example: Bilingualism is perceived by many French-speaking Canadians as assimilation. Second example: Bilingualism is perceived by many English-speaking Canadians as unnecessary, as something being forced upon them.

Tonight I would like to show, so to speak, the front side of bilingualism. If you show the front side of bilingualism you lessen the tension between Canada's two official language communities. Here are eight examples of that diminution of tension. Daniel is my helper. I would like each of you who is more English-speaking Canadian to do this test. Because my premise is, all of you know French but you do not know English.

Let's see if I am mistaken. You see here we have a common word shared by French and English people alike. The word is "accord." If you take the "c," the "o," the "r," which is part of the word "accord," you get right away the French word "coeur". Now by magic if you replace the "c" by an "h," if you replace the "d" by a "t," could you give me the English word you have here, people of Canada?

Mr G. Wilson: Heart.

Mr Pechon: Thank you, sir. You speak English.

I would like to answer. This is the front side of Canada where the pattern is evident. Why are English and French people fighting over 2,000 years? Is French distinct? Did you put or did the French people put the word "accord" into an English throat? For the past 2,000 years, an English throat is filled up with nothing but French words. I would like to make a recommendation to the English language. From now on the English language cannot say "accord," but "acheart."

Let's go to the second one. Could you do the second thing? I will give you a mark. Here we have a common word, shared by the French and the English people alike. The word is "direct" or "direct." Some groups in Canada take the whole word and say "mon droit." The same group next to the French people take only part of it. Could you guess the English word underneath?

Interjection: "Right."

Mr Pechon: I ask you one more time, is French distinct? Did the French people put the word "direct" into an English throat?

Third example: This is an English word shared by the French and the English people alike. The word is "unicorn." If you circle, the word is "uni." "Y" and "u" get the article in French "une" or "un." Next to the beautiful French people you have the beautiful English people who say?

Interjection: "One."

Mr Pechon: Thank you. You do speak English. I ask you a third time, is French distinct? Did the French force an English throat to receive the word "unicorn"? Monsieur le Vice-Président, could you make a motion again tonight?

that the English language from now on cannot say any more, "unicorn"? But my kids at school might say, "Monsieur, I saw a uni-horn." Daniel, merci.

This is the same English word "unicorn." One group of Canadian people say "une corne." The same group of Canadian people next to it replace the "c" by an "h." Canadian people, could you give me this beautiful English word? Monsieur Beer?

Mr Beer: "Horn."

Mr Pechon: Bravo. You see, French is not distinct. You speak English, you speak French at the same time. You did not know that. Oh, this is an English word shared by the French and by the British people. The word is "duo." This word, applied to French and English, gives the word "deux." Unfortunately, we come fearing "deux soliditudes." Ha, ha, ha. Another group replace the "d" in French by a "t." Could you tell me which English word you get by magic, Monsieur Gary Wilson?

Mr G. Wilson: It is not "three." It is not "one." It is "two."

Mr Pechon: I will give you a certificate of bilingualism.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, as much as I would love to be able to go on for ever—

Mr Pechon: Oh, just one for you, President.

The Vice-Chair: Is it the pleasure of the crowd? Is it okay with everybody out there? We will let him do one more? Okay. Do your last one.

Mr Pechon: For you, Monsieur le Vice-Président, we have this English word, the word "cathédra" or "cathedral." This is an English word. It is a French word. If you take only the "hed," you have the French word "sid" which the French people say "président." The English people took the whole word, beginning by "c." Could you guess which beautiful English word we have here?

Mr G. Wilson: "Chairperson."

Mr Pechon: Bravo, Monsieur.

Mr G. Wilson: Thank you.

Mr Pechon: Is a chair this thing from French? Merci, Daniel.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr Pechon: Conclusion.

The Vice-Chair: Very quickly, sir.

Mr Pechon: On page 16 of this document, it is written about the role of the French and English languages in Canada, "Progress has been made...but there are still some misunderstandings, and some Canadians believe something is amiss in how we're tackling the language question."

2030

I feel we must give priority to teaching attitudes and teaching how to learn French-English/English-French. For many years, I have taught French to English-speaking learners. I have always, always stressed common vocabulary, shared culture and shared history. What is helpful, attitudinally and linguistically, is what we share, not what we do not share. I have made every effort to demonstrate to my anglophone students that they were not learning a foreign language or a second language, but a cousin lan-

guage, a cousin language whose very words, culture and history have been and will be for ever intertwined with those of English. Paradoxical though it may seem—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up. You are going over your time limit.

Mr Pechon: Just one paragraph. It is or should be our language and culture which unite us, not divide us.

I am enclosing a copy of French in Disguise, a booklet I have co-authored to help students learn more easily and with a healthier attitude. If you see in it any merit—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to stop there. You have gone over your time at this point. There are others who want to present. We thank you very much for the lesson. It was very appreciated. Thank you. Merci beaucoup.

GEORGE ROBERT SHAW

The Vice-Chair: George Robert Shaw; after that is Daniel Chevrier.

Mr Shaw: Can you hear me, everybody? Everybody make my day.

Let's get down to simple reality. What is wrong with Canada has entirely to do with only one thing: the backroom politics of Canada that have gone on for 30 years. I love all the people of Canada, and all the good people of Canada are the same. They love everybody. We are all just human beings under God. This is a democracy. We are all supposed to be equal, we are all supposed to be beautiful and special, but that is not the case in Canada now. All of the people of Canada, French and English, are all beautiful, are all equal and are all politically innocent about what is really going on in the backroom politics of Canada.

Let's look at who the real racists and fascists are, not the people of Canada, just a few politicians, because Quebec has one thing the other provinces do not have: 100 seats out of 300 seats in the House of Commons. This is the big mystery of Quebec. It is no mystery at all.

I am going to quote the Premier of Manitoba, Gary Filmon, CTV National News, 21 June, Meech Lake:

"Quebec refuses to recognize"—he is talking about the government of Quebec, not the people of Quebec—"the multicultural nature of Canada. They refuse to accept the equal and democratic nature of the rights of all Canadians, and until they do, we feel that the accord as it stands is not acceptable to the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada, for they cannot see their own people's faces reflected in it. Until Quebec is willing to recognize the multicultural and democratic character of Canada, we are at an impasse."

I would like to quote Pat Carney, respected former Minister of Energy, to Barbara Frum, The Journal, June 1990, CBC:

"Barbara, I represent the people of the west coast, and I have 2,000 immigrant citizens' children in the Vancouver area alone, and they do not speak either English or French. And I go to Ottawa every month and there is only money for the French, only ever money for the French, and they don't want to listen to me. It's like they don't care, and I'm

fed up, so we want to break away and call the western provinces our own country, Pacifica."

The third quote—five minutes, to me, is an outrage. It does not give me a chance to express my democratic right—Brian Mulroney at the airport last summer when he greeted Gorbachev. First of all, a reporter sarcastically asked Mulroney if had anything to learn from Gorbachev when it came to the way he treated his minorities in Canada. Mulroney grew very angry and said:

"Listen, nobody can tell us how to treat our minorities. I want to tell you that I consider myself a Frenchman first, and 99.99% of us in Quebec are French only. In Quebec, we French are the majority and we speak only French. When you look at the history of this country, the whole country came into being only because the French willed it so. So all other Canadians owe the French people everything. They owe the French an enormous debt of gratitude."

Oh, really, Brian? Only the French? No one else? Not the vast majority, not all the beautiful peoples and cultures, not the first peoples, not all the other peoples of this land? None of us fought and died and worked and coexisted and built this country? "No," says Brian, "only the French."

All Canadians want to know what is hurting Canada, what forces are tearing her apart, what is rotting her to pieces and who is responsible. Well, those responsible are the three political parties of Canada, the Progressive Conservative Party, the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, for what is tearing Canada apart has entirely to do with vicious party politics.

Only the French. This is all we hear from the government of this country. The three parties tell us that of all the vast majority and beautiful cultures of peoples, with all their beautiful beliefs and languages, who inhabit this land, only the French are distinct, special. The word "special," of course, means superior. It does not mean less than, it does not mean equal to, it means superior. We are told the French are superior and deserve superior rights over all the rest of us, and to win Quebec's 100 seats the parties are only too eager to agree.

This is total racism, and the sad fact is that for Mulroney and Bourassa, Lucien Bouchard and Benoît Bouchard, Parizeau and much of the ruling élite, to be French, they believe, is to be superior, and we the vast majority must knuckle under as the Quebec government rapes the resources of the entire country and sends it all to Quebec via Meech and Allaire.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am here to defend my country. I am here because I am against all racism and fascism. I love all the people. They are all beautiful and equal. I and the people of Canada believe in democracy, and democracy means freedom and it means equality and it means equal treatment towards all. But democracy is not the case for the vast majority of Canadians now—the parties hate that word "majority"—including its first citizens, who have waited 500 years for justice. So naturally now we have a virtually exclusively French federal government cabinet.

Frenchness is not bad, English is not bad. The politicians have made it so. The gross total overrepresentation and favouring of one culture over all others is bad. Minority

rule is bad, for it is unfair and anti-democratic. And this is the sole cause of all the anger and confusion, of why all Canadians including native peoples are not getting their fair share. Only the French get. This is the source of all Canada's problems. The massive diversion of the country's resources to serve the minority instead of the majority is anti-democratic and illegal.

Let's educate ourselves, Canadians. Let's wake up. Let's look at how politics is really played in Canada, behind closed doors. Like the closed doors of Meech that Clyde Wells, God bless him, threatened to educate the Canadian people about, but his party shut him up.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up. You have about a minute left.

Mr Shaw: Well, that is outrageous. It is not democratic either.

The Vice-Chair: Those are the rules.

Mr Shaw: They are bullshit rules. I have waited 20 years to go in front of this commission.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, you are going to be—

Mr Shaw: The pie of Canada is really sliced up in the back room. Why do the French have total power over the vast majority? Simple. Consider this, first of all, as the politicians do, that of 10 provinces and two territories one province has a whopping 100 seats out of the 300 seats in the House of Commons: Quebec. Remember, Canadians, that what gives Quebec double vote power is that it is a single giant bloc of vote power, because it is all one ethnic culture. To catch the French vote the politicians decided to make Frenchness an issue, so they separated us Canadians into French and English, anglo and francophone, politically, socially, economically and now constitutionally, totally in favour of the French vote. To catch the French vote the three parties tell the French Canadians they are special, superior. People like to hear this, so naturally the parties catch the French vote.

Meanwhile, we English and all the other peoples of this land, the politicians trick us and sell us this French power under the guise of national unity when nothing could be farther from the truth.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you—you have gone over by a couple of minutes.

Mr Shaw: Well, I deserve it, God damn it. So here—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, one second—

Mr Shaw: Okay, I will sum up. Give me a minute—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, one second. There have been a couple of occasions now when you swore. This is public broadcast. We ask you to sum up in a couple of seconds.

Mr Shaw: Well, you do not follow the Constitution.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, that—

Mr Shaw: If you cannot take the truth, it is tough.

Therefore, on behalf of all the beautiful peoples of this land, I accuse the government of Canada and the three political parties of Canada of the following crimes against the people of Canada: absolute betrayal of the Constitution of Canada and absolute failure to uphold and defend and obey the Constitution of Canada; failure to uphold the

Charter of Rights and Freedoms of Canada; discrimination; political opportunism; racism; fascism; slander and libel, calling us all bigots; inciting race hatred among the people; race and cultural ignorance; race and cultural envy; race and cultural propaganda; complicity; conspiracy; duplicity; deception; blackmail; greed; theft, and most of all, total treason.

The Vice-Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, sir.

2040

DANIEL CHEVRIER

Le Vice-Président : Daniel Chevrier; after that is Isobel Allen.

M. Chevrier : Bonsoir. Mesdames et messieurs de la commission, la discussion dans laquelle on se retrouve ce soir doit se porter entre paramètres bien précis avec des données inébranlables : l'idée de société distincte et le rapatriement aux provinces, en particulier au Québec, de certains pouvoirs en matières qu'elles trouvent à leur goût et convoitent déjà depuis longtemps.

Au sujet de société distincte, je souligne qu'il n'y en a pas ici au Canada parmi les peuples immigrants. Les seules nations distinctes de ce pays sont les autochtones. Toutes autres sont survenants.

En ce qui concerne le rapatriement de certains pouvoirs aux provinces, la question qui me vient immédiatement à l'esprit est toujours : pourquoi ? Quel but national est-ce que cela servirait ? Pourquoi est-ce que les provinces veulent s'emparer de plus en plus de pouvoirs en juridiction fédéral ? Nous avons un système maintenant qui marche fort bien sans que les provinces deviennent de petits royaumes quasi-autonomes, ce qui suscite une autre question : pourquoi est-ce que nous tenons pour acquis que le fédéralisme ne marche plus, et que nous avons besoin d'un nouvel ordre constitutionnel pour faire face au futur ? Parce que Brian Mulroney, dans sa sagesse infinie, a ouvertement courtoisé et couché avec des séparatistes, et maintenant nous souffrons les retombées de ce mariage rompu ? Oui. Mais il ne faut pas laisser démanteler notre pays par un gouvernement fédéral négligent et incompetent sous la guise d'un fédéralisme renouvelé. Le rouleau de dés, avec sa police d'entente à huis clos, qui a précipité la crise dans laquelle on se retrouve ne peut maintenant s'approprier à la régler parce qu'il n'a plus la confiance du peuple et l'appui du peuple.

Il n'y a aucune négociation à entamer avec le Québec, aucun propos à entretenir en matière constitutionnelle parce qu'il n'y a absolument rien à négocier. La fédération canadienne n'est pas à discuter, pas à négocier et pas à vendre. Le Canada dans son entièreté appartient à tous les Canadiens. Qu'ils l'aiment ou ne l'aiment pas, les Québécois sont Canadiens et ça finit là, fin du compte.

C'est à peu près le temps qu'on vieillisse un petit peu et laisse les rancunes des plaines d'Abraham et des trois derniers siècles derrière nous. Cette idée que le Canada anglais ne comprend pas le Québec est complètement et absolument fausse. Le Canada anglais comprend fort bien que le Québec sait comment se servir de ses insécurités linguistiques et culturelles et de ses blessures historiques, réelles et imaginées, pour faire chanter le gouvernement

fédéral à tout bout de champ avec ses menaces de non-coopération et de séparation. Il faut que quelqu'un prenne l'avance et dit que c'est fini les jeux : c'est le temps d'agir comme des adultes, des adultes responsables.

De quoi est-ce que le Québec a besoin pour être heureux dans la Confédération ? Des pouvoirs spéciaux ? Des pouvoirs discriminatoires ? Dans une société juste, ce sont des propos qui vont à l'encontre des droits et libertés garantis par la constitution, et la constitution garantit l'égalité. Il n'y a pas de plus égal parmi les égaux. Nous commençons tous d'un point commun d'égalité. Sinon, qu'est-ce qui arrive ? Ce qui arrive dans le pays maintenant : chaque province, chaque petit groupe a sa propre liste de demandes, ses propres revendications, mais personne n'a le cœur de regarder la situation dans son entièreté. Et c'est ça le problème. Il faut arrêter d'être égoïstes parce que notre pays a besoin de nous aujourd'hui.

Notre pays a besoin de l'affirmation de notre canadienneté. Si les Québécois ne sont pas prêts à le faire ou s'ils ne sont vraiment pas heureux avec les provisions d'une constitution qui garantit à ses citoyens une société juste et équitable, ils peuvent s'en aller. Il n'y a personne qui les tient prisonniers ici. Et le Canada n'a pas besoin de traites. Alors, allez-vous en, partez au vent, faites de l'air le plus tôt possible. Mais, ah oui, le Québec reste ici avec nous, dans la Confédération. Trouvez-vous un autre pays à détruire. Les habitants de la région géographique du Québec n'ont aucun titre de propriété sur la belle province. Elle est, a été et sera toujours canadienne. Mais les mécontents, s'ils veulent émigrer, il n'y a personne qui les empêche.

Je ne demande rien pour moi-même de mon gouvernement, mais il faut régler responsablement le dossier amérindien une fois pour toutes. En même temps, ou aussitôt après, il faut s'adresser à l'indemnisation des deux nations fondatrices européennes qui ont initié la colonisation, l'ouverture et le développement de ce vaste pays en appuyant le bilinguisme officiel.

Je lance le défi à mon gouvernement ontarien de prendre le rôle de leadership abdicqué par le bouffon de Baie Comeau dans cette nouvelle ronde de la crise nationale imaginaire. Et notre position doit être, faut être très ferme : il faut que le Québec sache sans équivoque qu'il n'y a absolument rien à céder, rien à négocier, que le Canada reste entier et notre constitution telle qu'elle est se fasse respecter sans nonobstant. L'Ontario peut faire preuve de sa bonne volonté en renonçant son droit de recours à la clause «nonobstant» sans que le fédéral cède quelque chose en retour. Le message aux autres provinces serait clair. C'est à leur tour maintenant de faire la même chose.

Sans un gouvernement fédéral centralisé et fort qui protège les intérêts de tous les Canadiens sans égard à leur race, religion ou politique, nous cessons d'être une Confédération et devenons par défaut plusieurs petits duchés éparpillés ici et là sur une carte géographique.

ISOBEL ALLEN

The Vice-Chair: Isobel Allen; after that is Barry Brown.

Ms Allen: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, I represent a group of seven concerned

citizens who love and care for our country and province and their future. This brief is based on the questions in the excellent document *Changing for the Better*.

How can we manage our economy to meet people's needs? Eliminate trade barriers between the provinces. Make better use of all our human resources, including women, minorities, the disadvantaged. Increase linkages between manufacturing and agriculture, between manufacturing and education, etc. Use our know-how.

Do Ontario's economic goals differ from other parts of Canada? Economic goals of Canadians are basically the same. We must have a concern for those individuals who are economically deprived. We must be concerned about Ontario's economic health. There is a need for nationwide goals.

How can we ensure that we become more competitive internationally without compromising goals such as full employment, price stability and equitable income distribution? We need an accurate measure of our industries' competitiveness with international ones. We must plan for economic progress. We must make a joint international venture.

What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? Where possible, government at the federal level should provide adequate cost-sharing and the provincial level should provide the services, the feeling being that services should be administered as close to those in need as possible.

The federal government needs to provide unifying elements that will help bond Canadians coming from different backgrounds. This should be done by discontinuing the providing of funds for ethnic or religious education in the public schools. Ways should be devised to strengthen national pride, that is, flag, national anthem, ceremonies, links to the Commonwealth.

The provincial government should co-operate with initiatives taken by the federal government to bring together the first ministers of all the provinces and the territories and should discontinue interprovincial trade barriers as well as discontinuing the funding of ethnic and religious education.

The relationship between the federal and provincial governments should be repaired so that their mutual goals can be achieved in a spirit of co-operation. There needs to be a harmonious relationship rather than an adversarial one.

How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? The time has come when every effort possible must be made to settle the land claims of the native peoples, however complicated they may be. Those claims are intimately linked with the desire for autonomy, an aspiration requiring the consideration of most aspects of social life, from the judiciary to native business enterprises. To realize such hopes will require an investment in an educational system fashioned by native peoples with particular emphasis on their needs, to function without reliance on existing government agencies.

What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada? If Quebec remains in Canada, bilingualism at a federal level should continue, but provision of services in

French should be determined at the local level as needed. If Quebec separates, French speakers in the rest of Canada will adapt themselves successfully, as many other linguistic minorities have.

What is Quebec's future in Canada? There are three basic choices facing the citizens of Quebec: (1) to form a separate state; (2a) to join in a semi-detached association with the federal government that is linked only at the top; or (2b) to enter a loose grouping of a number of regional governments; (3) to renew and renegotiate a strong centralized federation that will carry out the mandate from the populace to restore, provide and maintain unity so that, with due regard to the rights of every minority, a commitment to the ideals and values of Canada will be accepted.

2050

What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region? These regions are the physical anchors that stabilize the country and, with their unique cultures, help define Canada. Ontario should urge redistribution of the seats in the Commons and the Senate and increase the number of Supreme Court judges for its benefit. Ontario should also encourage transfer payments, advocate the restoration of the CBC outlets, Via Rail, local post offices and seek ways to remove the distrust and envy of central Canada by the rest of the country.

Finally, what does Ontario want? First, we want to thank the Ontario government for setting up the select committee on Ontario in Confederation to give people an opportunity to voice their opinions. This is an opportunity which is long overdue in this country. It will go a long way, towards reducing the feelings of powerlessness of the populace. We hope the opportunities for consultation will continue on other bases and issues.

While upholding the traditions and systems that have made Ontario great, we must now grasp new realities that need to be incorporated to mould a finer province and hence a finer country. We must invest in our future by creating stimulating, challenging employment and providing training and retraining for it, especially for our young people.

We realize that in the five minutes of allocated time we have not been able to include in our oral presentation the fuller specifics that are incorporated in our longer brief. It is our deepest hope that Canada will continue as a nation and that all parts will agree to work together harmoniously and with goodwill so that Canada will develop to its greatest potential. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

BARRY BROWN

The Vice-Chair: Barry Brown; after that is Cha Kalevar.

Mr Brown: Members of the committee, we have seen in many of the presentations that have come forward, both in this committee and in other provinces across the country, a lot of anger and optimism, pessimism, patriotism, but most of all frustration in trying to find some definition for where the country is going. As many others, I am here to present my five minutes' worth of what I think can be done to get the country back on track.

There are three brief points I would like to raise regarding the current constitutional debate: first, the need to educate Canadians about what our nation stands for; second, a sense of humour about our identity; and, last, a provincial referendum on any constitutional change.

For the past six years I have worked as a Canadian correspondent for a wide array of American media covering Canada. If I tell Canadians that I write about Canadian culture, they ask, "Do we have any?" Canadians will criticize Americans for their lack of knowledge about Canada. Yet, alas, most Canadians know little beyond the bare bones of our history and reasons for becoming a nation, or at least we have a lot of disagreement on what it is about.

Indeed, once when I commented before a group of pro-English Canadians that ours was a nation founded on democratic principles, not demographics, I was met first with stony silence and then with arguments that Canada had rejected the American style of democracy for a paternalistic order based on the English-French demographics, something we are finding a lot in these committee hearings.

While it is true that the white male democracy originally created by the Americans, despite their ideals—they had much the same problems as we did, of course—both their country and ours have changed over the years. The difference now is that most Americans have a firm grasp of the principles they stand for however much they may disagree on their application, while we as Canadians too often still see our democratic values as handed down from institutions rather than as vigorously applied rights.

What this tells me is that Canadians must undertake to educate and celebrate the history and democratic values of this country as if we were selling Canada to foreigners, because, alas, that is what most of us are, foreigners in our own country.

During the past 20 years or so, we have emerged from an infant democracy huddling against a mother country and mother culture for protection to an adolescent democracy rebelling against those same parental strings. In Quebec French Canadians rebel against English Canada, while English Canada rebels against the Americans.

Now we are at a crossroads. One choice we face is the ultimate rebellion against each other, splitting the union, dividing the assets and hoping the children understand. The other, of course, is to forge a Canadian identity based on what we are: a democracy full and flourishing by the will of the people, proud of the road we took to get here and even prouder of our future accomplishments.

One path I believe we have not exploited in the development of our history and culture is a sense of humour. While we come out for these sombre and reflective sessions, we must also be able to laugh at our own follies. When America was going through its civil rights crisis, a TV show called *All in the Family* debuted to poke fun at the ideological extremes. Why is there no such weekly sitcom about the French and the English, easterners and westerners, or a Canadian *Roots* about black Canadians and others not members of the dominant demographic?

Curiously, there is a television sitcom called *Frogs* that is running. It is not about French Canada, however, but Hong Kong immigrants to Canada, known as frogs because they

leap-frog across the water. If you have not heard about it, it is because it is a Hong Kong television show. With only a few years left before they are taken over by China, Hong Kong television is running a show on Canadian immigrants that Canadian TV would consider too controversial, which brings me to my final point.

Prime Minister Mulroney says holding a referendum to validate any forthcoming constitutional change would be an offence against the British parliamentary tradition. Well, I find his attitude offensive. This is not Britain. Unlike Britain, we have a Charter of Rights and Freedoms, two official languages, strong provinces and a host of other constitutional and historical differences that Mulroney cherishes, or is supposed to.

Leaving decisions of this kind to politicians perpetuates the idea that this is a country ruled again by demographics and not democratic principles because—no offence to the committee—most provincial and federal politicians remain white and male, something I know a little about.

If the new Canadian identity is not based on principles that we as individuals have had a definite and fundamental say in, it will not hold. Democracy is not a privilege granted by politicians, no matter how the event occurred historically in this country. I would implore the Ontario government to press unyieldingly for a national referendum on any constitutional change. If Ottawa refuses, Ontario should shame it by holding one here and pressing every other province to do the same.

Why should Quebecers alone have a referendum? Is that what makes them distinct, that they are more democratic, if you want to call it so? If so, when are we as Ontarians going to be a distinct society? Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

CHAI KALEVAR

The Vice-Chair: Chai Kalevar; after that is Ron Leitch.

Mr Kalevar: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for this opportunity.

I agree with the previous speaker on his opinion about Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, but I disagree that Canadians do not have a sense of humour. I think Canadians have a great sense of humour: they elected Brian Mulroney twice.

It has been said quite often that we do not know what the Canadian identity is. At home we are all in trouble whether we are English Canadians, French Canadians, native Canadians, Canadian Indians, or new Canadian Indian or like myself. The fact is, once we are outside we are very quick to say, after saying we are Canadian, "not American." We derive our identity from outside of Canada, looking out. We are probably the first nationality in the world which is looking out to derive its identity.

Geographically we are located between the two superpowers, the United States and the USSR. Historically we are linked to the two imperial powers, the British and the French. All four of them, supposedly advanced democracies of the west, are the thugs of the United Nations Security Council, yielding veto, not vote but veto, basically saying: "Might is right. I have a birthright to veto." But Canada,

unlike the four thugs it keeps company with, is a voting democratic member of the United Nations. I think that is something Canadians can be proud of. Canada has also participated in all UN peacekeeping operations. That is also something Canadians can be proud of, at least I am.

2100

As a member of the Commonwealth, la Francophonie, the Granite Club, if you like, of the world, the G-7, and the Organization of American States, you could almost say Canada is the glue of the world. Canada is in a unique position to play a very important role. It has the demographic diversity, the linguistic talents and the racial diversity that are required in a shrinking world to reach out and meet all countries of the world. It can become the superpower of peace. It can become the superpower of world public opinion. Canada has the potential. Let's not fritter it away.

What has one of the thugs down south tried with Canada? It has tried what is known as Star Wars. In the last decade, it started with Star Wars, it has started with free trade, and thanks to our branch plant Prime Minister, I think Washington started us on the path for Meech Lake. Thanks to a native Canadian, the true democratic societies of the native peoples, Meech Lake was defeated.

I must say at this point to David Peterson that if he had had such forums before, he probably would be still in power.

But now, let's get on to free trade. Free trade would not allow any one of us to escape. We have a six-month clause to cancel it. The question is: Are the Liberals and the NDP willing to put aside for the next election their partisan differences and behave as Canadians first? It is possible for the Liberals and the NDP to exercise their Canadian-first identification and defeat the Tories and free trade.

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to sum up, sir.

Mr Kalevar: In summing up, I would like to say once again I am very proud to be a Canadian, because my Canadian colleagues have a disapproval rating of more than 80% for Brian Mulroney.

The last point I would like to make is that there is a commission like yours in Quebec called the Bélanger-Campeau commission, before whom I tried to appear but could not. My argument remains that though they claim they are going to decide on the future of Quebec only, by deciding on the future of Quebec they are deciding on the future of Canada. As a Canadian not resident in Quebec as of now—I have lived in Quebec and paid Quebec tax before—I feel that commission is going beyond what a provincial commission is entitled to do. I do not care if they go ahead and double the taxation in Quebec. I am not in Quebec now.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up. You are running over time.

Mr Kalevar: My summation is, when you do talk to the Bélanger-Campeau commission, please point out to them that there are people outside of Quebec who strongly object to their recommendations and decisions which break up Canada. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

RON LEITCH

The Vice-Chair: Ron Leitch, and after Ron Leitch Eleanor Burke.

Mr Leitch: Mr Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Ron Leitch, and although I appear before you as an individual, I have no hesitation in stating that I am the national president of the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada. Although I registered for this hearing as a representative for some 20,000 members across Ontario, I was given only individual status. My direct appeal to the Premier did not even receive the courtesy of an acknowledgement.

Canada is at the crossroads in its very short history less than one and a quarter centuries. It is seething with discontent, not just in the province of Quebec but from coast to coast. This discontent can only be eliminated if true democracy is restored to the people. The overdevelopment of the party system of government makes politicians unaccountable to the people. Democracy ends at the ballot box.

What do Canadians want?

That Canada should have a government of the people for the people.

That the people should have the power to control their local representative throughout the term of office.

Equality of status for all Canadians.

That governments will not legislate special status for any group within society.

That government grants with tax dollars for special groups within the country or province should cease. In support of this concept, I would refer you to the article of Daniel Damov in the 20 February 1991 issue of the Financial Post entitled, "Me-Firsters are Pulling Canada Down." The prime example of this philosophy is the demand of francophones all across this country to be treated specially.

That there should be one official language for Canada—the language of the majority, English. In a multicultural society such as Canada has become, language for governments is a matter of communication, not culture. I stress we are talking only about government. Canadians, even in the province of Quebec, should have the right to use the language of their choice in their business, social, fraternal and religious activities.

That no act of government shall encourage separation, segregation and isolation of any group within society. Unity comes from tolerance and understanding, but tolerance and understanding can come only from intermingling of all the facets of society. To separate, segregate and isolate our children from an early age through the educational system can only serve to foster intolerance and misunderstanding at a later stage in life. There should be but one school system, one board of education in each region or municipality, so that this intermingling can commence at an early age.

In summary, if we are to have a united Canada from coast to coast, and I believe most Canadians want this, there must be certain basic premises accepted before negotiations can begin:

1. That constitutions are for people, not politicians. Negotiations for constitutional change must be carried out by an assembly of the people selected by the people.
2. That all amendments to the Constitution shall be approved by a referendum of the people before coming to force.
3. That the amending formula for a referendum of people shall be: (a) an overall majority of the people of Canada voting for the change; and (b) a majority in at least six provinces.
4. That there shall be one official language, English, and the regional language, French, in the province of Quebec.
5. That the Constitution shall provide for the equality of status for all Canadians.
6. That no act of government shall cause or tend to cause separation, segregation or isolation of one group of people from another.

110

As Mr Damov states in his article, "If we can't live together in peace with each other, we will lose the country." Particular aspirations of any group within society must become the responsibility of that group and not government. People must share the responsibility for making excessive demands, but politicians are equally as guilty for giving in to those demands. Politicians must come to a realization that they are the problem, not the solution, and until that happens there cannot be a united Canada. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much. Mr Leitch, before you go, I would just like to say a couple of things. First, with regard to your saying you sent a letter to the premier's office, I am sure you will get a response to that letter. The second thing I would like to point out is that there was no slight. If you applied as a group, I do tell you that your group has applied, your local chapters have come before the committee in other communities. There are many groups that applied to get status before the committee. Unfortunately, something must have happened, and it was not anything we intended to do. I was prepared to let you go a little longer, considering that. So please accept my apologies. We do want to hear from everybody and we were not trying to—

Mr Leitch: I believe I was confirmed as a group and then subsequently told I was not.

The Vice-Chair: Just so people understand, the number of requests to come before the committee were a lot more than we anticipated. Numbers are basically in the thousands. Some of the groups, not only yours, which did want to present—ACFO, the French group, wanted to present here so. They did not get on the list, and a number of other groups. So it was not any intention of trying to exclude one group or another, but I was prepared to let you go for a little longer if you needed it, considering the situation.

Mr Leitch: Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: I thank you very much, sir.

PHOENIX ASSOCIATION

The Vice-Chair: Next is Eleanor Burke, and after that is Melville Phipps.

Mrs Gaby: Thank you, Mr Chairman. This is Eleanor Burke and I am Mary Louise Gaby. This is a brief submitted by a small group of people called the Phoenix Association.

The Phoenix Association was formed on 29 January 1991 from the ashes of the Association of Women Electors of Metropolitan Toronto. We called it the AWE. The AWE for almost 50 years observed the meetings of city council and its committees, and later on, Metro and its committees. Action was taken in many municipal areas: housing, education, health, election procedures, etc. Unfortunately, because of the changing lifestyles of younger women, we were obliged to wind up our organization in 1985. Now our concerns for the future shape of Canada caused us to reconvene under our new name, the Phoenix Association. Suffice it to say that we are seniors by now.

Most of our group of 12 or so are past presidents of the AWE and bring a wealth of experience and a lively interest in the political process. To date we have held four lengthy meetings to consider at least parts of the document *Changing for the Better*, and hereby accept your invitation to talk about a new Canada. We are not going to talk long.

We would like to make a few points on which we have reached some agreement: First of all, a renewed federation for Canada. We decided our preference would be for Quebec to remain within Canada, but of its own free will. At the same time, we realize that some adjustments will have to be made to accommodate this. One thought is that after almost 125 years Canada's Constitution may need a complete revision. We were intrigued by the idea of a constituent assembly, but time did not permit us to develop the notion to any extent.

We agreed that before any separation of Quebec might take place, a thorough study of the economic and social consequences of such a separation to all parts of the country should be undertaken and the results communicated to the country as a whole. Only by presentation of the facts and careful analysis of the details can the public understand the issues and be in a position to voice its opinion about the future.

I was pleased to hear this afternoon, when I was listening on television to the submission by the Canadian Bar Association—Ontario, that it made much that same point, that the public really is looking for more information.

We discussed a role for Ontario. We see an important role for Ontario as a new Canada emerges, one of conciliation and negotiation. We feel that Ontario, with its large francophone population, its historic business ties with Quebec and its tourism and trading links, is in a special position to use its influence in working out new federal arrangements which could benefit all Canada. Ontarians' experiences with native people, with the special problems of the resource communities, as well as those of the large cities, puts it in a privileged position, but we see Ontario taking a neutral flexible stance of listening and communicating. We are convinced there are many closet federalists in Quebec whom we in Ontario are not reaching. We would urge the Ontario government to develop ways to

make federalism seem more attractive to Quebec, possibly through more exchanges by students, business, the professions and particularly the media. Again, the lawyers seem to be ahead of the pack on this one: We must know each other better.

Communicating the process of constitutional change: We would recommend that Ontario give special attention to communicating the ongoing process of constitutional development. We would appreciate being informed of the ideas being considered by the government to enable us to react to them as time goes on. Only by a vigorous exchange of ideas can a new federalism be forged that will satisfy such a diverse and far-flung country as Canada.

One last point on multiculturalism: Originally Canada's multicultural policy was designed to make immigrants feel welcome in this country and at ease with their accents. Several of our group are European immigrants from the 1950s, and they stress that they left their homeland and came here to become Canadian. They perpetuate their customs and language in the privacy of their homes. Our group feels, however, that Canada's multicultural policy has become divisive, that it tends to exaggerate differences and does not present a vision of a united Canada. We suggest that the policy as it now stands sometimes plays into the hands of groups who, instead of leaving their ethnic problems behind them, bring them with them, causing conflict, not the unity that we are after at this critical time in our history. Therefore, in the light of present-day circumstances, we suggest the time has come for a thorough review of our multicultural policy.

In conclusion, we would hope that Canada can show the rest of the world how a culturally diverse country can design a Constitution to accommodate its diversity, yet maintain a viable whole.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

MELVILLE PHIPPS

The Vice-Chair: Melville Phipps.

Mr Phipps: Mr Chairman, I must say that just reaching this microphone constitutes a victory for me. I would like to introduce a little humour, but I do not know whether I have time, so maybe I should just start right in with what I have.

Let me put my position forward as directly as I can. I believe Ontario should assist Canada in helping Quebec achieve what it wants: recognition as a distinct and unique society. Ontario should do this by not opposing the separation process. It should use its leadership role to ensure a fair deal and to help Canada, sans Quebec, to become more united and stronger by being sympathetic to other regions and by undoing some of the harm that has been done in trying to appease Quebec.

The reasons for this position are as follows: I think Canadians like myself are fed up with Quebec's tail wagging the Canadian dog. We want to put our head out the window and shout, "I'm mad as hell and I'm not going to take it any more." I think you remember that fellow in New York City.

2120

The reason for this attitude is that we have three federal parties, but they have no hope of forming a government unless they have the support of Quebec, so Quebec gets what it wants. It bothers me to think that it is possible that we may never have another anglophone Prime Minister. That is just the way it is. The present government has many senior ministers, francophones, who have stated publicly that they could put Quebec before the rest of Canada, and have done so. I do not think we can allow this to continue. How do we fix it? I think maybe the easiest thing to do is let Quebec go.

As a result of Quebec's influence, we have had some legislation passed and decisions made that are very destructive to our nation.

Multiculturalism: a program to preserve and enhance cultural differences at taxpayers' expense—great for Quebec, with a basic one culture that everyone can support, but very divisive, destructive and costly for the rest of Canada. I think the multicultural attitudes or programs have to be completely reviewed.

Official bilingualism: not accepted by Quebec but in place across the rest of the country because of Quebec. It's very damaging to harmonious relationships right here in Ontario, with no essential benefit that I can see to the province and tremendous cost. I might point out that I was at an Etobicoke Board of Education meeting last night and I found out that we have a French board, and the average cost of running that French board is \$11,400. The average cost of a general public board is about \$6,000. When you start talking about getting into your pocketbook, in these times that tends to make people very upset.

But there are a lot of other things this committee has heard before. Big contracts—Quebec must get its share of the aircraft maintenance program, Hibernia oil contract and now we have \$45 million going to a cultural centre which apparently is on hold, but it will get it.

Free trade: a lot of people are against free trade, but they believe Quebec was for it, because it has much more control over its industries.

I suppose you could add to this issues where Roman Catholic beliefs may be a factor, and there are other examples.

I therefore support Quebec's desire to separate from a country that is broke, borrowing money every day to finance its bad programs and from a government that is so confused that there is no political will to do anything about it. In other words, I think I came from a better Canada a few years ago, at least one where you did not have to work from January to July before you started getting any money for yourself.

The role of Ontario: If Ontario had played its role well back when, when Sir Oliver Mowat was Premier, a balancing power against Quebec and its influence through the federal government, if that had been the role it played, it might not be in the crisis we are today. I do not know how many of you know what Sir Oliver Mowat was up to, but when the federal government decided to push, he pushed back. You know about that. You know the western boundary of Ontario would not be where it is today; it would be

way east, because that is where the federal government wanted, it to make a smaller Ontario.

Ontario's support for Meech Lake, which Bourassa wanted to fail—I am sure Bourassa wanted it to fail; why would you come to negotiations with no chips to give away?—that was fatal to the Ontario government. Ontario should now show leadership in fighting for the best deal possible for the rest of Canada, and I think it is going to be a fight. Mulroney is certainly not the man for the job.

Finally, I believe no one should look at separation in a negative way or as failure on the part of Canada. The British Empire is not now what it was once simply because the British have always been tolerant when questions of self-determination arose. I think and hope that there is enough British heritage left in us Canadians to do the same. I guess I have not used up all my time?

The Vice-Chair: You caught me; I was writing a note. Actually, you are a bit over your time.

Mr Phipps: Well, I will not tell you why I am so bitter about bilingualism then. You have all met the guy with the dustpan, eh? He is going around the street saying, "They've put me out of business." He has this dustpan, beautiful thing, and it has embossed across the top "dustpan," and he says if it not labelled in French, he cannot sell it. If that is what official bilingualism does, I am agin it.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

RETA McWHINNIE

The Vice-Chair: Next on the list is Reta McWhinnie. I would like to say something before you get started. We are running quite a bit behind schedule. We have some 14 people left on the list, which will probably bring us between 10:30 and 11 o'clock. We will do our best. If people try to keep to the time as much as possible so we do not have too much over, we should be able to get everybody through. Thank you.

Miss McWhinnie: Mr Chairman and committee members, I appreciate this opportunity to contribute my views to this committee. It is a great idea, and I am happy something constructive is happening. In view of what you just said, I am going to reduce my comments, which you have mostly heard before in one form or another, and I have a suggestion. I am going to skip through some of these things and will leave a copy of my complete submission.

From what I have been reading in the past few weeks, I learn it is a time for two stark choices: (1) to accept Quebec's demands; and (2) for all provinces to demand the same rights. We have discussed that matter in various ways here tonight. If we do, we have less than two years to decide if this country has a future. We face a severely weakened Parliament in Ottawa if all provinces demand equal rights. It is very unlikely it would endure, and we would all drift to the USA. But Canadians have shown that when tested, as in the Gulf crisis, they are indeed a brave, passionate, committed people, a nation that quietly cherishes its independence, its internal diversity and its unique history.

Canadians from all walks of life and from all parts of the country should seize this moment and get together and

talk about finding ways to preserve this country. I believe that, and that if we do that, we will give the next generation the opportunity it deserves to carry on Canada for the next 10 years or century and beyond that.

Here are some quotes. Someone has said, "What Quebec wants is for me not to have a country to live in." Another view: "Quebeckers instead want a country in which they feel at home themselves." The idea of one of Quebec's wisest experts on the Canadian Constitution, Leon Dion, of the best tactics for dealing with the rest of Canada is brutally simple: "English Canada will not give in to Quebec's demands unless there is a knife at its throat"—not a very long-term solution, I think. I cannot see the ordinary Quebec citizen with a knife in his or her hand ready to threaten me. Claude Ryan, one of Quebec's Liberal Party's most respected figures, said pointedly, "There has to be room for discussion...of Quebec's proposals." I say, let's talk among ourselves.

All Canadians must decide if they want to accept the new country Bourassa says Quebec wants. Why can we not hear from the people of Quebec? There must be lots of interpreters—I hear one back here—for us who are not fluent in French. We have been paying for years for people to be trained in the French language under federal programs. Why can we not spend our money on what we want? It is useless to continue to criticize Mulroney. Political leaders, journalists, media spokesmen are doing our thinking and talking for us. We need to confront each other and ourselves to know what we really think and want.

It is great to have the opportunity to give you my ideas. It would be great to get some feedback from you, the committee members. The other folk here, we have heard from them, but I would like to discuss our similarities and differences with them. It would be greater still to talk personally, to actually see and hear folk from St John's, Newfoundland, Yellowknife, Trois-Rivières, Vancouver, Sault Ste Marie, to hear how the people in Calgary and Windsor feel about being cut off from CBC television, to hear how the prairie folk are making out after the rail cuts in service; or about the Montreal-based Tudor Singers whose future may be in jeopardy.

2130

Now more than ever, we need to keep in touch. I think it is great that commissions and committees are going about the country to hear from people. We need that and the people themselves very much need to talk among themselves. I feel that has been very well witnessed here tonight. A lot of money is being spent on this project. I suggest that serious consideration be given to promoting travel for citizens from different parts of this country to get together, make special bus and train fares available, to give a refund on submission of a report to members of organizations whose membership is nationwide and who will have an annual or any other meeting this year, who will be getting together somehow and who will put on their agenda: "Your input to the Constitution, or how to keep Canada together, or do you want to have a country?" and make a report to this committee.

I am finished. I just want to say this. Perhaps a member of this committee could act as the chairman or co-ordinate

such a group in different areas. Perhaps billeting could be arranged. This suggestion has been enthusiastically received by some groups to which I belong, and also I think you will be hearing from the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and Ontario's Women's Action Coalition, which asked for a copy of this submission. I think it is a great idea and I think you have had lots of support for the idea to continue. We have a lot to say.

The Vice-Chair: We are prepared to listen. Thank you very much. Just on that note, people should understand that this is not the end of the process after today and tomorrow. The committee will be putting together an interim report, and after the interim report is out we have other consultation we do that might take different forms, such as the things you talked about, doing some grass-roots stuff. We understand that people need to be listened to, and not token listening, but listened to and acted on. It is something that is very serious for us anyway.

HENRY RASTON

The Vice-Chair: Henry Raston; after that is Grant Walker Gunness.

Mr Raston: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, first I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you tonight. The parliamentary political system has served Canada well, but has served for a very long time with not any substantial changes. However, time does go past and the needs change as well as the expectations of the Canadian people. Therefore, I feel the whole political system in Canada should be reviewed and modified where necessary to increase the accountability of politicians to their electorate, to increase the opportunities for greater direct input by the citizens of this country and to ensure that the various regions of the country have a more effective voice in Ottawa.

I suggest that to achieve this, the Senate should consist of elected members, the seats of the Senate being assigned to each province in a way which would ensure a fair representation of all the regions of the country, to force both the MPs and MPPs to be more responsive to the wishes of their electorate. No loss of a vote, either in the Parliament or in the Legislature, should force the resignation of the government, not even in budget or money matters. This would allow the MPs and MPPs more freedom to vote against their own party if they felt their own electorate demanded it. The only way to force the resignation of the government would be to move a motion of non-confidence.

In addition, Parliament should take example from the US Congress and establish a number of standing committees which would have the power to call witnesses who are citizens, who have the opportunity to be heard.

Finally, the Constitution of the country is for us, the citizens, not for the politicians. Therefore, all draft amendments of the Constitution should be submitted for approval by the citizens in a referendum in each province and, depending on the result of the referendum, only then should be voted in a free vote by the legislatures in individual provinces.

No province should be allowed a veto power over any constitutional changes. The fate of the Meech Lake accord

should have proved to those who had any doubt about it that a unanimous agreement of all the provinces is impossible to get, and an approval formula based on an veto is impractical and would make any constitutional changes virtually impossible.

At the end of all those constitutional changes, we should still have a reasonably strong federal government to ensure that it can speak with authority on behalf of the whole of Canada in all international forums, a federal government strong enough to be able to transfer funds from the richer provinces to the poorer to ensure that all Canadians, irrespective of where they live, can enjoy the same level of social services, the same quality of medical care and the same quality of education, and that all are guaranteed the same degree of personal rights and freedoms.

I for one have difficulty in visualizing Canada without Quebec, and feel we should recognize that Quebec is a distinct society, one with a different language, different civil code and different culture than all the other provinces. The problem with the Meech Lake accord was, in my opinion, that it did not define what was meant by "distinct society." What exactly were to be the powers given to Quebec to protect that distinctiveness? It is the fault of our Prime Minister and some of the other politicians—

The Vice-Chair: If you could sum up, sir.

Mr Raston: I only have very little left—the Quebecers came to believe that a rejection of the Meech Lake accord meant the rejection of Quebec by the rest of Canada. After all, Mr Mulroney said it over and over again and it was repeated endlessly by the media that a vote against the Meech Lake accord was a vote against Quebec.

It is now the duty of all our leaders to go to Quebecers directly and to try to convince them that the rest of Canada wants them to remain within Canada, but at the same time that it is in their interest to do so. We should make it very clear that if Quebec secedes from Confederation, there will be no business as usual, that Canada will not guarantee Quebec's loans necessary to repay its share of Canada's national debt and to compensate Canada for all the various investments within Quebec made by Canada over the years. If Quebec secedes, it should not be treated any differently than any other foreign state. It should be made clear to them that secession would mean a considerable drop in the standard of living.

While we should be prepared for some compromises the price we are prepared to pay for the unity of the country should not be so high that it would leave us with a federal government too weak to hold the country together. Canada is more than a sum of all the component provinces. If we allow it to fall apart, all of us, all Canadians in every province, will be the losers. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

GRANT WALKER GUNNESS

The Vice-Chair: Grant Walker Gunness.

Mr Gunness: I support the Prime Minister of this country, the Right Honourable Prime Minister of Canada Brian Mulroney.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, can you sit down and say that into the mike. Nobody can hear you from back there.

Mr Gunness: If you listen, you can hear me. The upcoming elections, as announced under the hand of the Prime Minister of Canada, will be 3 October 1993.

My name is Grant Walker Gunness. I am the president of Canada. I have founded a charity called—

The Vice-Chair: Can we ask you to speak into the mike? This is being recorded for people back home as well as here and we cannot hear you unless you are speaking into the mike. Thank you.

Mr Gunness: Okay. I am going to read from this book to the reader and to the listener. This is opening chapter of the light spreading from east to west and west to east again: "Oh, say, can you see, by the dawn's early light, What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming."

The Vice-Chair: Shall we stand?

2140

Mr Gunness: Go right ahead. That would be great. God bless you. Jesus Christ, Jean Peters and Francis Xavier Cugat.

These are symbols. The upper one is the Canadian flag. The second one is an architectural homology of the star of the United States of America, the Soviet star, and stars like it in the world. The bottom star is called the Yahwehan star. It is the Yahwehan Star of David.

The Vice-Chair: Can I ask you to stick to the topic? There are many people who want to speak and we should be speaking about what this committee is all about, in reference to the Constitution.

Mr Gunness: I am speaking about what this committee is all about.

I am going to read the alphabet for you. In the alphabet I am reading, you will find the name of ourselves and our children under the letters A to Z. I am Grant and I am under G. There are many people in Jerusalem, in Egypt, whose names start under this alphabet as well, when it is translated into Arabic.

The unity of this nation, Canada, does not end at the extent of the CN-CP rail lines in this country. It extends around the world in 80 days.

Ladies and friends, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V, W, X, Y, Z, Zoya, Canadian for love, meaning life.

Mary. My wife's name is Mary and I am Joseph.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I am going to have to ask you to confine yourself to the topic. There are many people here who want to speak and we are running out of time. What will happen is that—

Mr Gunness: Sir, okay. I am confining myself to the subject.

Claude I. Taylor, Roland Ritchie, Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Pierre Elliott Trudeau is running along with me and John Turner in the riding here in Canada, of Trinity, as members of Parliament, Senator. You are either a Senator or you ain't. We are going to have an elected Senate in this country that will sit along with members of Parliament and that is

the congress of this nation. Jerusalem is the congress of Canada.

This will happen in the united states—the united states of Africa, the united states of South Africa.

The unity of this country and the leadership of Canadians, the founding—

The Vice-Chair: Could you sum up, please?

Mr Gunness: Okay. The founding of this country has been based on a non-violent tradition where we chose among us to band together as a people, one nation under God, and as president of this country, that exemplary example of our parents shall continue.

Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, Mr President.

JOE ARMSTRONG

The Vice-Chair: Joe Armstrong.

Mr Armstrong: I do not quite know if that is a tough act to follow or not. I think it is. Maybe that was the humour you were supposed to receive.

Members of the committee, in the interest of speed, I am going to race through four pages, and I hope to stick very close to your time limits in consideration for other people.

My name is Joe Armstrong. I am an author, historian and heritage activist. I own and share with Canadians Canada's finest private collection of the art and discovery maps of this nation. The collection was featured in the Ontario Legislature during the 1984 bicentennial of the province.

I am the author of *From Sea Unto Sea*, *Art and Discovery Maps of Canada*, the author of *Champlain*, and the French edition, *Samuel de Champlain*. I am the author of the 1982 brief to the Commissioner of Official Languages entitled *Bilingualism and the Federal Public Service of Canada: A Moral and Legal Crisis*. This is a brief which I will make public today. For three years, I served as a director of the Ontario Heritage Foundation. I am also writing a book called *Crisis Canada: A Constitutional Street Guide*. It is a nightmare to write such a book.

My family legacy: I am a descendant of 11 generations of Canadian and American ancestry. My great-great-grandfather Samuel Armstrong settled in York county in the late 1700s.

Values: I hold that Canada is not bargainable. Let me be clear. There is no politician, no elected official in this country who has the mandate whatsoever to either divide this land or craft the means of its destruction or even a mandate to craft its restructuring.

I also hold that all of us are equal. I hold that our Constitution, our new Constitution should reflect this. I do not embrace the critically flawed Charter of Rights and Freedoms with its attendant "notwithstanding" clause.

I also believe profoundly that the first frontier is that we are Canadians. The only reason Canada is threatened is that Quebecers have been nurtured into a stronger vision of Quebec than Canadians have of Canada. What a commentary that is about our national and cultural institutions.

Where we went wrong: I suggest three reasons. 1. The false premise: The false premise assumes that there are

two founding nations of Canada, the English and the French. This is the pudge-headed thinking of the élitists and sophists who know absolutely nothing about our complex heritage and history. This false premise can be traced to the Duntou-Laurendeau Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism report of 1963, which resulted in the Official Languages Act of 1969 and the unfolding tragedy thereafter. We must now address this historical fraud or we are finished as a nation.

But even accepting that the B and B commission was well intended and that, as the commissioners put it at the time, "Canada was passing through the greatest crisis in its history," the fact is that the vision of the commissioners was betrayed. The commission and the legislation that followed, the Official Languages Act, called for a game plan with rules of fair play. The legislation, for example, called for the setting up of a bilingual district advisory board.

But after a feeble effort, the Prime Minister, along with a co-opted official languages commissioner, began the process of law-breaking that moved official bilingualism from a carefully worked out binding framework of bilingual designation to the pernicious self-serving power agglomeration arena of political discretion.

2. Multiculturalism, the political handmaiden of official bilingualism, Bill C-92: Multiculturalism is Canada's second-largest cultural tragedy. No nation can survive the legitimization and fostering of divisions within. In our unbelievably smug arrogance that we are not an American melting pot, we have made a deliberate choice to downgrade at every turn our Canadian heritage in favour of government nurturing of state-promoted multiculturalism. Multiculturalism was the state bribe to legitimize the acceptance of politically manipulated official bilingualism. We are the only nation in the world that has such a bill. That alone should cause us to ask some questions as to why.

3. Constitutional dereliction of duty by first ministers: The first duty of every Prime Minister is to defend a nation's Constitution. In Canada, this has not been done. In Canada, weak leaders have let us down badly.

I cite three examples:

In 1974, the failure of Pierre Trudeau to have Parliament strike down Robert Bourassa's Bill 22, which was offensive to section 133 of Canada's Constitution. Section 133 protects the English language as an official language of Quebec. Bourassa's Bill 22 determined that admission to English-language schools in Quebec was racially conditional. This surrender to Bourassa may have proved fatal to the nation.

In 1977, the failure of Pierre Trudeau to have the House of Commons disallow René Lévesque's Bill 101, which declared that French was the official language of Quebec. Again, offensive to section 133.

In 1988, the failure of Brian Mulroney to have the House of Commons disallow Robert Bourassa's Bill 178, again for the same reasons.

2150

Observation and summary: All of Canada needs a wake-up call, especially in Quebec.

My recommendations are that we can settle for nothing less than a fully democratic state. We cannot play this

game of colonial élitism and state-engineered racism any longer. Our parliamentary heritage demands it.

Canadians—not politicians, political parties or branches of government—own the sovereignty of the nation. The people must have a full opportunity to fashion the nation they want.

To empower the constitutional process, we need, both by population and region, constituent assemblies with elected delegates to do the job of crafting a great Constitution for Canada. The United Nations judgement against Canada's Constitution is due at the end of March. On 31 October the United Nations human rights committee unanimously condemned Canada, severely criticizing the "notwithstanding" clause in our Constitution.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up.

Mr Armstrong: The final judgement on this matter from the UN is due in the next few weeks. Let's get on with it. We have been wasting time with mediocrity for too long. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you.

LOIS BEDARD

The Vice-Chair: Next is Lois Bedard.

Ms Bedard: I am Lois Bedard. I am the sixth of seven children born and brought up in the province of Ontario.

The Vice-Chair: Madam, I would ask you to make the presentation at the seat.

Ms Bedard: I am sure they are going to hear me or the mike. I am a teacher who projects her voice.

The Vice-Chair: Our technology may not be up to that snuff yet.

Ms Bedard: I, Lois Dowson Bedard, am the sixth of seven, born and brought up in the city of Toronto, third generation Canadians. My parents raised seven children through the Great Depression and through the Second World War. My siblings older than I were educated up to grade 12 and entered the skilled trades, so my father, an artisan of the printing trade, had two executive secretary daughters, three tool and die maker sons and one son, a skilled compositor in the printing trade.

All of our family were active trade unionists—something I have not heard here much—working collectively to help the working class earn a more appropriate share of this wealthy Canadian economy. We all worked to see that the political arm of the workers, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, forced the Canadian economy to establish a social benefits network that would prevent Canadians from ever going through another Depression.

So what is it to be a Canadian? It is to be born or naturalized in a magnificent, wealthy country in the North American continent. It is to be an educated and skilled and productive worker. It is to be a member of a trade union or a citizen who benefits from the fact that other workers in trade unions have raised your standard of living. It is to be a member of a society that has a third party that is the political arm of workers, the CCF or the NDP, a political arm that can force a standard of living in keeping with the wealth of the nation. It is to be a citizen in a country that has the benefit of two great cultural streams, English and

French. It is to be a citizen of a country that has the influence of many other cultures brought with Canadian immigrants into the multicultural nation of Canada.

The Canadian central government was forced to introduce universal hospital insurance, universal health care, universal unemployment insurance, universal old age pensions and Canadian pension benefits. A Canadian central government was needed to enforce uniform standards in these universal programs in each province through transfer payments to the provinces, based on regional disparity planning. All these benefits we listed above were strenuously fought for and won. They are the hallmark of being a Canadian.

Another hallmark of being a Canadian is our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In 1981 women won the equal rights clause, and in 1991 Canadian women wish to continue to improve on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, along the lines of the attached document. It is all here, clause by clause.

The Constitution is a living document, to be crafted to improve the life of its citizens. It is right and proper that the Constitution be revised periodically to reflect the needs of the nation's citizens. The constitutional crisis is not caused by the continuous drive of the Québécois to determine their own future as a nation. It is their democratic right to do so. No nation can survive without the consent of its constituents. The Quebec question is to be settled by the Québécois in their drive for self-determination.

The constitutional crisis is not caused by the demands of the native people for treaty rights, settlement of land claims and self-determination. As the first nations, they have the right to have their own relationship to the Canadian Constitution.

So why is there a crisis in the Canadian Constitution? Canada has gone from colony to junior partner of the United States élite through its corporate power. Canada's big business is thoroughly continentalist. Canadians did not heed the Waffle's warning of the Canadian sellout to the US capitalists. Canadians gave in to the silent surrender described by Clement. Our capitalist élite is more concentrated than in any other capitalist society. The fundamental centrifugal forces of the Canadian economic decay are dictated by our corporate élite, by the corporate élite of the US imperialists. We are designed to be under the US trade bloc focusing on continentalism, while the new order leaves Europe Inc in charge of Europe, and the Pacific Rim in charge of Japan. The new Gulf coalition is still trying to settle the roles of the other members of the G-7 international nations.

If we in Canada let the free trade agreement, the GST and the made-in-Canada recession establish the level playing field with Mexico, then our provinces will do business with contiguous states on a north-south basis and there will not be a Canada that we recognize or value, just as Mr Mulroney has predicted.

What are we to do? Rescind the free trade agreement—

The Vice-Chair: Ma'am, I would ask you to sum up.

Ms Bedard: —withdraw the GST and tax on a graduated scale in proportion to wealth. Let each province in

Canada in 1992 establish a constituent assembly that will start with the 1991 revised Charter of Rights and Freedoms as the basis for unity. Then let each province establish the assembly to evolve the format of a confederation of provinces. This constituent assembly has to be representative of our population, women and men, labour, multicultural and aboriginal people. This representative body will evolve a democratic, elected, representative system of administering an economically viable Canadian state.

It is not essential that we have one continuous border. Alaska and Hawaii are part of the USA. We Canadians exist as a country rich in natural resources and skilled people. The alternative to wholesale integration into corporate continentalism is a socialist, independent Canada. Canada does not exist to meet the US needs for water, oil or any other trading bloc imperative. Through the mechanism of workers' self-management, community involvement in the goals of production, it would be possible to provide production for need and not just profit.

New Democrats are now the government or official opposition in every Legislature west of Quebec, including the Yukon. We can forge a new Constitution in a new socialist Canada. I am an internationalist who believes that the role of socialists in a nation is to build socialism within and without our native boundaries for the best of all worlds. Please take some time to read this.

The Vice-Chair: We will, ma'am. Thank you very much.

ITALIAN CANADIANS FOR PROGRESS

The Vice-Chair: Art Bossio, and after that is Al Trent. Just so people know, we are running behind. We are going to try, if at all possible, to get everybody on, but we still have another 10 to go and we are running an hour over as it is now.

Mr Bossio: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Art Bossio. I represent Italian Canadians for Progress, which is a business and professional organization in the east end of Toronto.

Canada's cultural pluralism is the very essence of our Canadian identity. Cultural diversity, multiculturalism, a reality of Canadian life, is in fact the source of our greatness as a people and as a country.

We, the Italian Canadians for Progress, strongly believe that all Canadians, regardless of colour, race and religion, must be given equal opportunity to realize their full potential as individuals. Yet in Canada, our population is divided into three categories: francophones, anglophones, and the remaining 9 million citizens as "other." In Ontario alone, over 50% of our citizens are labelled as "other."

2200

As no definition of multiculturalism has ever been legislated by the government of Canada, the door has been left wide open to the interpretation that multiculturalism is only for some Canadians and not for all. Surely the intent of our government could not be to create separate classes of Canadians. Therefore, we propose that the government acknowledge all citizens as Canadians first, each with widely differing beliefs, values, attitudes and traditions; that this government would begin to realize and see that

that which we want and value in our own lives is what government should want and value for all Canadians as a whole.

Do not ignore 9 million Canadians from minority cultures which represent this nation's future new majority. We may not be able to trace our origins to either France or England, but our pride and love for this beautiful country are unmatched. Therefore, Canadianism in this broader context must be emphasized in future advertising and public education venues. The diverse reality of a united Canada should be clearly evident at all levels of our social, cultural, economic and political institutions. The success or failure of this concept should not depend on any single Canadian or group of Canadians, but on all Canadians collectively. There should not only be a willingness to accept the philosophy and the concept itself, but there should exist a firm commitment from all citizens to maintain and live within their culture but in a Canadian context.

To achieve this, there must be a willingness to support one another in our everyday interactions. It is just this willingness which will enable us to break through the prejudice and cultural jealousies to ensure our future as a free nation. We believe in a united Canada for all Canadians, achieved through our rich experience of living harmoniously together, notwithstanding our own unique diversities. Thank you.

AL TRENT

The Vice-Chair: Al Trent, and after that is Maria Greifeneder.

Mr Trent: Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak in front of the committee. I would like to start out by paraphrasing Bob Rae in a statement he made before a bunch of union leaders, that the institutions that fed so well and overleveraged themselves and overspent themselves during the 1980s would have to be responsible for paying the price during the 1990s, given the current economic conditions. I would like to know, within that statement and the parameters of that statement, where a government whose rate of taxation is increased at the same time that the national debt and spending is increased, both in real terms and as a percentage of GNP, would stand.

Essentially, it is my belief, after reading a report forwarded by Garth Turner, the member for Halton-Peel, to the Minister of Finance—one of the ideas contained in that report was a constitutionally mandated balanced budget at all levels of government. The obvious goal he meant in forwarding that proposal was the control of the burgeoning and massive debt and growing deficit problems we now face, which preclude our ability to spend our way out of the recession in Keynesian fashion, as well as slow down any economic recovery the country might enjoy.

Further than simply reducing the debt, I believe such a system would add a significant amount of political accountability into the whole political process. If government is to be judged on the basis of what it can provide for the amount of money it receives in taxes, I think it would be a far more equitable proposition if the electorate were to have a fair opportunity to view the cost-benefit ratio of

government, namely, what government collects versus what the benefit to them has been.

The situation as it exists now is not a situation where government strives to become re-elected by becoming more efficient and making the most of scarce resources. Instead, government now functions on the basis of: "How much money can we promise to borrow to give people what they want and appease them? If we get elected we've got the job done, and if we don't get elected we simply pass on the debt to the next government." Basically, as stated, if we were to run with the system whereby government was mandated to function on a balanced budget, we would restore a means of accountability to the system wherein people do not need degrees in investment finance to figure out what the government is doing for them and what it is actually providing.

An even scarier part of this report by Mr Turner is that fact that 2% of respondents to a poll he conducted considered the deficit and debt an economic problem, but only 21% of respondents could define what a deficit was. This is more scary than the actual problem of the deficit itself is that, if the results of these polls are correct, it allows government to basically carry on a process whereby it can misrepresent things to a populace that basically does not have the understanding of how debt and deficit affects our economy, and in doing so continue on a more and more destructive course.

I support Mr Wilson's budget. If anything, I think it did not go far enough in slashing the deficit. I understand fully the need to get ourselves out of recession. However, if you were to explain to the average Canadian person that every man, woman and child in this country owes \$15,000 as a proportionate share of the debt, the solutions that the opposition parties are proposing are tantamount to saying "Well, my family can no longer afford to pay the mortgage on our house so I'm going to go out and borrow money to buy a car in order shut everybody up for a while." To my way of thinking, this will lead to an ever-growing problem in that area.

The other thing is that government policy, both fiscal policy and policies pertaining to education and other social services—

The Vice-Chair: I ask you to sum up, please.

Mr Trent: Okay—have to not only reflect some kind of equality and fairness, but have to dictate the mindset of the nation. I do not believe that, in the case of Ontario certainly, we do a very constructive job of that. It is virtually impossible, given the current tax and inflation situation, to invest in any kind of secure vehicle without having an actual net reduction of your purchasing power. This type of attitude, the result of this, is simply that we have an economic system that is geared towards consumption and waste and has no recognition of the value of putting money back into the economy, not in the form of spending, but in the form of investment. That is basically my feeling on the topic.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

MARIA GREIFENEDER

The Vice-Chair: Maria Greifeneder.

Ms Greifeneder: Thank you, Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to thank you for allowing me a few minutes of your time. I will try to keep brief, in view of the hour.

Our obsession with categorizing beliefs by superficial criteria, ie, gender, race, language, has taught me the importance of being politically aware, active and persistent. I also learned the necessity, if not desire, to participate in this discussion, since as a Canadian I also have the right to express my thoughts.

Official bilingualism and multiculturalism: To embrace them reflects tolerance; to object breeds racism. Such is the theory of a cultural mosaic like Canada. It is that simple—or is it?

Aboriginal people: Do we assimilate them or ignore them?

Have we lost our identity or are we gaining a new one?

Quebec's role: To be part of Canada or to be independent?

Minority language rights: Parlez-vous anglais, monsieur et madame? Ou parlez-vous français?

Indeed, these are just some of the questions.

I would like to speak briefly about what makes us Canadian. It has very little to do with language, colour, religion or race, because in reality we are of a variety of all those things. For all of us who are willing, we will find our place in Canada. As a nation, Canada has attempted to reflect the best of all worlds but, with regret, I think we have failed in that endeavour. The ideas are great. It was our way of achieving them that went wrong.

Canadians should have the right to protect their previous cultures, and I will defend that as long as we live. However, I do not believe we need government funding to do it. Canadians of German, Swiss and Austrian heritages have nurtured their cultures through private resources.

The aboriginal people have waited patiently as our leaders have dillyed and dallied with 200-year-old treaties. We have to honour these agreements. By settling the land claims and implementing native self-government, Canada will be a richer country, because at long last it will in fact be a fair one.

2210

Official bilingualism can be solved by defining it before we implement it. If Canadian bilingualism is to be nationwide, immersing all children, including the Québécois, in both languages is in order. If on the other hand our bilingualism is by region, then we should adapt the Swiss model in which each region has one official language. Whatever the definition is, I urge you and your colleagues to reflect very carefully before segregating children by language. If they do not learn to live together while they are young, today's linguistic intolerance will accelerate.

Furthermore, I have heard Mr Harnick of the Progressive Conservatives become aggressive with presenters who opposed official bilingualism during previous hearings. Is

Mr Harnick aware that his party opposes official bilingualism in Ontario?

I have thought long and hard about the recommendations of Quebec's Allaire report and I for one believe that Quebec is treated as well and at times better than other Canadian provinces. The report seeks to make Quebec exempt from Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It affords the province powers equivalent to a strong central government. It dictates Quebec's balance of power on issues regarding all provinces. It affords la belle province with a veto on all constitutional amendments. The late Senator Eugene Forsey described Allaire as "neocolonization of nine provinces with Quebec as its imperialistic leader." We sought independence from England. Why would we want colony status with Quebec?

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to sum up, please.

Ms Greifeneder: If the Allaire report is Quebec's bottom line, it is time for Canada to elect a team of fair but tough divorce lawyers. However, if it is the basis of negotiation, we must make every effort—and every effort sincerely—to reach an agreement that is fair to all partners in Confederation.

As we build a new Canada, we must learn from previous mistakes. While respecting the unique qualities of our multicultural fibres, we must become Canadians without hyphens, without labels. We must define official bilingualism as determined by the people of Ontario and Canada. Government must learn that excessive legislation builds more barriers than it removes. Quebec must decide whether being one of 10 provinces in a strong nation is better than separating for superficial language reasons. As our political adolescence concludes, indeed we must enter adulthood with reason.

Ontario's role in the new Confederation is one of knowing the difference between wants and needs. Canadians must end their romance with political apathy, for it is apathy that wins elections for the wrong governments and the wrong candidates. My grandfather, a former diplomat, died believing that politicians are well-paid hypocrites.

The Vice-Chair: Ma'am, I would ask you to sum up. You have gone over.

Ms Greifeneder: We need politicians with more honourable professions. Perhaps more involvement by qualified women will help make the political process a bit more honest.

Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the committee, for affording me a brief audience with your esteemed group.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

CARLA BERG

The Vice-Chair: Carla Berg, and after that is Dave Boese.

Mrs Berg: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Carla Berg. I am a scientist.

Following the era of discoveries, the Renaissance, Industrial Revolution and so on, my contention is that we are living in a brand-new era, the global era of reasoning. Yet in Canada, our compulsion is to define what our country

is, one nation or two. In the global community, Canada must stand as one strong and united nation. For example, the European common market represents consenting standards for economic trade of the nine nation members. From that perspective, my argument is that Canada is one country and one nation.

Canada identifies and accommodates French and English culture and language. Simply put, Quebec's role is the same as that of nine other provinces. Canada's future must be decided by all provinces, territories and native peoples.

Quebec's linguistic, cultural, religious and other rights were protected with the Quebec Act of 1774 and reaffirmed when she entered Confederation with proclamation of the BNA Act in 1867. Pursuit of her equal rights has dominated Canada's political scene since. Quebec's culture and language are unique, and it is its responsibility to preserve it. My difficulty is understanding how an artificial reinforcement will offset natural differences of those two cultures.

Now Quebec wants independence with economic benefits from Confederation. Quebec must reason out: Is it a part of Canada's Confederation or not? If Quebec chooses to remain in Confederation, she should do so without specially appointed powers or privileges. I question the validity of Quebec's protectionism and obsession with her language. Independence is her legal right. If that is her choice, it is reasonable to believe in her competence to assume her role as an independent nation within the global village of nations without benefits of its neighbour, Canada.

I support introduction of a second language, English or French, at an early age, in grade 2, but within one publicly funded school system. Without segregation, we could accomplish a bilingual future for Canada.

Legislated bilingualism is unacceptable in Quebec, also in Ontario. Legislators may remember that people or their virtues cannot be legislated. Economic progress is based on productivity cost for output, not a language or culture. In a democracy, we have the right to self-determination and to make the wrong choice.

Before amending the existing Constitution, we must reconsider the role of federal, provincial, regional and municipal governments. Our only solution to the present constitutional impasse is a national referendum on all constitutional amendments.

What is wrong today? We must look into our past to recoup our identity and values. Progress in multiculturalism for those who value their roots represents strength; if shared, enriches it. Jewish people retained their religion, culture and language nearly 2,000 years without a country or access to taxpayers' pockets.

The Vice-Chair: Ma'am, I would ask you to sum up please.

Mrs Berg: I came to Canada 35 years ago from Austria. This is my national costume. My knowledge of English has improved. Learning and adaptation to Canada's structure and lifestyle did not impair my previous education, culture or knowledge.

Ja mislim da razumete sta sam rekla. Ich glabe sie verstehen, was habe Ich gesagt. A Roma si parla italiano. A Ontario si parla inglese. A Quebec si parla francese. My question to you politicians is: Quo vadis dominus?

A mosaic or patch without sharing adhesive will result in the assembled patches falling apart. Pride in diversity should not ignore the necessity of common values and cohesive power as a prerequisite for unity.

Canada's generosity, now dominated by special interest groups, is a divisive factor. Minorities never agree except in collective efforts to reduce and oppress the majority. Nothing needs reform as much as people's habits.

In summary, a strong, united nation has a common goal and values to share. That includes understanding, sharing and willing exchange of national heritage among the participating members—and of course we share a \$400-billion national debt.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

2220

DAVE BOESE

The Vice-Chair: Dave Boese. Again, I remind you we are running late and we have six more to go.

Mr Boese: As presenters, we should have taken a course in auctioneering. It might have helped things.

The Vice-Chair: We want to apologize. We realize the difficulty this gives the presenters and we sympathize. The difficulty is that there are many people who applied. We tried to accommodate as many as we could. It is meant to say to shorten the presentations, which rushes you, and we are aware of that.

Mr Boese: I was born in Canada, so I am a natural Canadian citizen, proud of it. I have travelled this country across two or three times and enjoyed every part of it. My background, though, is German and my heritage is German. I would say I am fairly fluent in German, so I am bilingual. My forefathers, some time in the early 1800s, left central Europe for the land of opportunity, which was the Ukraine or the southern part of Russia, because it was the land of opportunity. Then in 1929 and 1930, around the Depression time, they moved to this country because this was the country of opportunity. They left religious persecution and communist oppression.

One of the things I am a little concerned about in this country—I hope I am seeing it wrong, but I have a feeling that we are gradually losing some of our freedoms. I hope that some time in the future my grandchildren and great-grandchildren do not leave this country to move back to Russia because it is more free there than here in Canada. Anyway, my simple philosophy in life is basically this: Live and let live. That gives you a bit of an overview of where I am coming from.

The problem as I see it is this. You have all heard the phrase "Beware a wolf in sheep's clothing." I do not think the issues are properly defined, and this may not be the proper definition either, but it is a little different, I believe. I believe the issue is not about language rights; the issue is about power. I believe the issue is not about cultural differences; I believe the issue is about money. I was glad to see

n article about Bourassa, where he says that presently he thinks the economy is more important to him and the Quebecers than the constitutional talks or whatever. It boils down to money really. Last, I feel the issue is not about equality so much as it is about dominance.

I am not trying to be funny. I think it is just a quirk of human nature. To my knowledge, there are only two people in this country or in this world you could trust when they speak about equality, that is, Mother Teresa and myself, and I am not too sure about myself. So beware of that, okay? There will always be a battle no matter which way we go.

I am going to go quickly on the rest. I have it in point form.

My observations on things that divide us.

Two official languages, I say, will never work. I know it is pessimistic and negative, but it will never work.

Separate laws for Quebec and for the rest of Canada.

Quebec arguing for bilingualism and acting unilingual.

Economic disparity between provinces.

In our province now we have two school boards, big mistake. And by watching these hearings, I am hearing they want to start a third school board. Wow. Look out, taxpayers.

Interprovincial trade barriers: You have heard this all before, but what a joke, eh?

Minority rule: I think there has been a common thread running through these talks about how our country is really run, so keep that in mind.

I believe very strongly that culture is a private thing and should be kept out of politics. As an analogy, I want to tell you that I really enjoy eating French bread. I really enjoy eating Italian bread, and every time I make an Italian meal, I go out to my local Italian bakery and buy a loaf of Italian bread. But when I bake my own bread, which is quite frequently, I make German bread, and no one is going to change that because that is my heritage. That is the way it should be. I do not want anybody telling me what I should do in my own kitchen or in my own bedroom.

Trade with other nations: Free trade under the present conditions is a sellout. The playing field is not level. You have all heard this before too.

Economic wellbeing is more important than culture. You cannot eat patriotism, you cannot eat pride and you cannot eat promises. I want to tell you right now, before anyone accuses me of being a heretic or unpatriotic, I believe there are 8 to 10 million Canadians, supposedly calling themselves Canadians, who are really closet Americans, because they are voting with their money every single day. I am not talking about going to the US just for a two-week vacation, which is fine. But they are voting with their money every single day by the millions of dollars. They are voting with this money, and they are not voting for Mulroney and they are not voting for Bob Rae; they are voting for George Bush. There it is, that is where it is going, over the river. Border cities like ours can become ghost towns within 10 years unless something is done about it, believe me.

Most of Quebec's problems are internal. Maybe I should not get into this, but it is a perception that a lot of us have. The Catholic Church has probably had a greater influence and effect on Quebec's economic plight than anything else the rest of Canada has done. I will skip the next part.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up. You are up to five minutes now.

Mr Boese: I have had five minutes already? Wow. I want to ask you as legislators, never underestimate your power to do good and/or bad.

I will go to my recommendations. I have three recommendations: Plan A, with Quebec in Confederation. I want Quebec to stay. We all do. Invite them to stay and to sign the repatriation papers showing good intent. We should separate culture from politics, just like church and state. This is not meant to be funny, believe me. You had a native person this morning who was trying to make a little light of some of these things. I am not trying to make light of this: through an act of Parliament make one of the Indian languages the official language of Canada and let the rest of us speak what we want to speak.

The Vice-Chair: Sir—

Mr Boese: It will not take long now.

The Vice-Chair: Well, you are cutting into the time of other people and somebody is going to get cut off the list. I am sure you do not want to have that happen.

Mr Boese: I would like to have every politician in this country read *Atlas Shrugged* by Ayn Rand, if you have not read it.

In finishing up, as we do not have the time, I would like to leave you with this. As a young man I was a Jaycee for 15 years. Some of you have probably heard this creed before, the international creed of the Jaycees. If this were part of our Constitution and the people in this country believed it, we would not have the problems we have today.

"We believe that faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life, that the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations, that economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise, that government should be of laws rather than of man, and that Earth's greatest treasure lies in human personality and that service to humanity is the best work of life." Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

BLOOR WEST VILLAGE VOTERS

The Vice-Chair: Ken Salah, and then after that it is Robert Campbell.

Mr Salah: Mr Chair and committee members, I represent 12 friends and neighbours from Toronto's west end, and we feel that after a long sleep of complacency Ontario has finally woken up to the reality of the dangers facing Canada's nationhood. The people in Ontario seem to always have had a quiet unspoken pride in being Canadian, but this does not seem to be enough any longer. It is that sense of pride that stirred us into making this presentation.

We resent politicians who claim that without Quebec Canada will no longer exist or will somehow have no

national identity. Should the division of our country become inevitable, we feel confident that Canada is going to survive politically, economically, socially and as a very strong and vibrant nation.

As the analogy of a marriage has often been used to describe the relationship between Quebec and the rest of Canada, we would like to continue that analogy for a moment. Would any reputable marriage counsellor ever advise a partner in a troubled marriage to remain in the relationship only because the counsellor believed that without his or her mate, the partner would be nothing, destined to wander in a wasteland, dazed, without any sense of self, while the divorcing partner is going to move on to build a full and rich life elsewhere? We would expect that such a counsellor would be out of a job really soon. We would prefer that a course of moderation and reconciliation in which respect is shown for both partners would be reaffirming their trust and faith in the union.

We also feel there is a huge vacuum in Canada in terms of leadership. We want to hear from leaders who will address the issue we have just mentioned. Are there no leaders who believe in us? Are there no leaders who believe in a strong Canada and that it can exist without Quebec? The leaders of Quebec have been planning on the separation of Canada for a number of years. The rest of our leaders have been focusing on how to keep Quebec in Canada, but they have yet to address publicly, in a positive manner, the issue of what Canada would be like without Quebec.

2230

We also feel our present government has dismantled virtually all of the symbols that held us together as a nation. It is imperative that we reclaim some of those symbols and build some new ones; otherwise the remaining ties that bind us together may not hold and the north-south ties that pull us are finally going to bring us into the United States orbit.

We ask Bob Rae to come forward. We want him to be one of those leaders we are so desperately looking for, to come out and speak out now, to help the people of English Canada find a sense of pride and nationhood and to also find a way to accommodate Quebec in Canada.

The following is how we feel about the topics in the guide you provided.

1. We want a strong central government in Canada, whatever happens to Quebec. We still want a federal government to be able to implement national programs and a national vision. We are concerned that the rights of women, aboriginal peoples, regional disparities are not going to be protected or addressed as well by provincial governments as they will be by a strong central government.

2. We know the Constitution must be changed and we feel it should be changed, taking into account the needs of native peoples and multicultural groups and not just the needs of Quebec. We feel the Constitution must not be hastily changed in response to a threat of a referendum in Quebec, but the changes should be made gradually and be well thought out, and with the approval of the public, not just the politicians.

3. We feel bilingualism as a federal policy is not working. Many people in the rest of Canada seem to resent the expense and the fact that while bilingualism is in the rest of Canada it is not in Quebec. We suggest that national bilingualism as a policy be scrapped and that each province hold its own referendum on whether it would be bilingual.

4. We would like to see an elected Senate and that the representation should be equal from all provinces.

5. If Quebec leaves we feel there must be a great deal of discussion about the representation in the House of Commons, since Ontario would then have roughly half the population of the country. There may be many ways of accomplishing this. It could be addressed in several ways. The west will never consent, though, to stay in Canada if Ontario becomes the sole power. We also would like to see the Prime Minister be elected by direct vote—the party system has let us down terribly—a system such as the United States, where the president is elected directly and separately from the House of Commons.

6. Our group was divided on sovereignty-association. Most of us are against it. We feel that if Quebec wants to leave, it should leave completely, otherwise we would be financing its independence.

The Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up.

Mr Salah: I am on my last point. One person in the group wanted to leave them in with sovereignty-association, because it might be the chance for them to come in if they change their minds.

We realized that there are going to be hardships for both Quebec and Canada if there is a split, but we feel it would be worth it, because it would leave each of us as our own separate countries, to develop economically, socially, and without the animosity that is going to persist from being financially dependent on each other.

I just want to leave you with one bit of philosophy from Nietzsche, who said, "He who has a 'why' to live can bear with almost any 'how.'" Maybe we should think of that as Canadians: the "how" of how to live with our nationhood. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

ROBERT S. W. CAMPBELL

The Chair: Robert Campbell; after that is Trudeau.

Mr Campbell: Mr Chairman, I am a solicitor presently retiring from private practice in Toronto, and welcome this opportunity to present the following views to your committee on the subject of Ontario in Confederation. I am not a member of any political party, but I am vitally concerned with the problem of Canadian unity, the preservation of Confederation and the maintenance of Canadian independence and sovereignty. I am distressed to have witnessed in recent years the erosion of Canada's capacity to recover and exercise an important, enlightened and independent role in international affairs.

I have taken an active interest in these and related matters as a member of the Council of Canadians, a national non-partisan body of Canadians who are deeply concerned about the future of their country. The council is presently

conducting a survey of its members which will lead to a consensus of individual views and a formulation of the council's position on the country's constitutional difficulties. The views presented in this submission are my own and are among those under consideration by the council.

The issue of Canada's national sovereignty and independence is central to any decisions respecting change in the distribution of legislative powers in the Constitution between Parliament and the legislatures of the provinces. It is not possible to comment on Canada's constitutional crisis without taking into account certain events of the country's recent political and economic history which have weakened its political, economic and social structures. These events have exacerbated our constitutional difficulties and endanger the continuation of Confederation.

In 1983 the CBC Massey Lectures on Globalism and the Nation-State were given by Eric Kierans, who examined the economic position of Canada in the modern world. Professor Kierans, an economist and a former president of the Montreal and Canadian stock exchanges, who has held portfolios in the Quebec and federal governments, concluded that this is a world in which the power of the multinational corporation can rival that of the state. It is a world in which the United States adopts the interests of its multinational corporations as its own and as instruments of its foreign policy. The United States, as the dominant superpower, considers the security of the western world indivisible with its own and presides over it economically as a global community. In this global community, labour, resources and capital move freely across national boundaries, each country playing its part on the basis of economic efficiency.

Canada's role in such a world is as a supplier of raw materials, resources and energy. Kierans disagrees with this arrangement of the world, which creates a heartland with dependent peripheral areas whose governments must conform to the grand design. Canada has become such a peripheral area, reducing this country to the status of an American satellite, thereby compromising its sovereignty and independence. This condition is aggravated by Canada's dependence on foreign investment and by control by multinational corporations to an extent which even then was without parallel in the developed world. He contended that in such a situation corporate power threatens the processes of democracy in a way which is immediate and urgent. The Kieran lectures were delivered at a time when the Foreign Investment Review Agency provided at least some limitation over the complete loss of control of major enterprises not already foreign-controlled.

In the year following the Kierans lectures the present federal government was elected in 1984. It quickly adopted as its own the program of the corporate multinationals, which included a program of privatization of public enterprises; deregulation of the service sector; continentalization of the economy; the alteration of the tax structure to harmonize with that of the United States; and the reduction or elimination of social programs. Canada, its economy already dominated by foreign control, was declared open for business.

FIRA was abolished, the national energy policy was abandoned, the drug patent bill was forced through Parliament, and legislation to improve Canadian access to the American-dominated film distribution industry was shelved. All these steps were taken as a necessary preliminary to the passage of the free trade agreement, bitterly fought in the 1988 federal election and opposed by 53% of the voters.

Kierans's assessment of Canada's satellite status became blindingly clear in the free trade agreement, which gave the United States access to Canada's energy supplies, including oil, gas and hydro, at national prices with guaranteed sharing in the event of supply shortage.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up.

2240

Mr Campbell: In addition, the agreement appears to give access to water. Many of the provisions of the free trade agreement are incompatible with the maintenance of Canadian sovereignty. It is time for Ontario to voice the reality that the free trade agreement has been disastrous for this country and to demand that the provision for termination on six months' notice be acted upon.

May I have a word on the matter of—

The Vice-Chair: Very short, sir. We have three more presenters to go, and if we are timely, we will get it done.

Mr Campbell: My reference to the proposed constitutional discussions is that in this world of ultimatums, Quebec is obviously debating to establish its demands for new powers, its bottom line. Canada's bottom line ought to be the maintenance of its power to govern within its capacity to remain a nation. This power and capacity must be the capacity to determine its own policies, values and objectives independently of its neighbour to the south, however great and powerful, and the power to exert the will of its own people in carrying these policies into effect, maintaining those values and realizing those objectives.

Finally, I repeat my reference previously that Ontario must speak for Ontario before speaking for itself. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: I thank you very much.

TRUDY BRETZER

The Vice-Chair: Trudy Bretzer.

Miss Bretzer: Thank you for letting me appear before this committee today. There are several topics I wish to discuss in this paper, one of which is Canadian identity. Who are we and what do we stand for? Should Quebec be allowed to leave? Do we need changes to the Constitution, and how will these changes be made? Can we survive as a country?

It is my belief that before we can solve the problems of the Constitution, we must have an understanding of who we are. The Americans know who they are. They have a symbol, the Statue of Liberty. They believe in freedom, liberty and justice for all. These are fine ideas, and I am sure Canadians value them as well, but we as Canadians must find our own identity and not borrow from others. We tend to be a country that goes with the flow, rarely striking out on our own. While this may make us safe, it also makes us very dull. We should strike out on our own

once in a while and be daring. We should find our own values and symbols to believe in which would make us distinct. We have a great multicultural society in this country, great national resources in both human potential and environment. There is so much we have to deal with that a solution must be possible.

I firmly believe that Quebec should not be allowed to leave the country. Not only would we be cut off from the Maritimes, but it is my belief that we would eventually cease to be a country at all. We should, at all costs, keep this country together. People who advocate Quebec separating are looking for the easy way out. They seem to have given up trying to find a solution. Quebec does not make it easier by wanting its cake and eating it too. They seem to want all the powers, but prefer others to pay for it.

The federal government appears to be encouraging Quebec in this goal, not because the federal government believes Quebec should leave but simply for its own ends. They want to make sure they get enough votes in the next election. This is not a way to run a country, babying one province over others. All this accomplishes is disunity. The other provinces get jealous and demand the same treatment. This is what we are seeing now. All provinces should be treated the same as far as provincial powers go. All provinces should have equal representation in the House of Commons. The Senate should be scrapped, period.

The solution I would like to bring forward is first to get rid of the mandatory three-year waiting period for making any changes in the Constitution. This was one of the main reasons Meech Lake failed. Many of the provinces changed governments during the three-year period and rescinded the deal.

Once a change is made, it should become law then or during a shorter waiting period of not more than one year. There should be a national referendum on any major changes to the Constitution. This may be more expensive in the short run, but I feel it would be better in the long run. The reason for this is that more people would get a chance to participate and the public would feel less shut out and therefore more willing to accept what changes were made. Public participation is very important in any democratic society, the more the better. Too many politicians have the idea that only they are qualified to make major decisions. Nothing could be further from the truth. The public is probably more qualified to decide. After all, politicians work for us, not the other way around.

Some will say the public does not care. This may be true, but that is because we are brought up to believe that all we can do is vote. This is not true. The public must learn that they and only they have the power to change things. As long as they give their elected representatives the power, things will not change.

I believe in a strong federal government. This is not to say the provinces should not have a say, but you cannot have a strong country if there is bickering among the provinces over power and who gets what. Not only does it prevent the federal government from doing its job, but it makes us look bad internationally. People will think we do not have our act together, which may be true at this moment.

I believe this country still has hope. Things may look bad now, but they will get better. If all of us, people and governments, get our act together, I believe we will solve these immense problems facing this country. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

DAVID FOGARTY

The Vice-Chair: David Fogarty.

Mr Fogarty: Members of the committee, I have lived in four provinces of Canada: British Columbia, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Ontario. In each province, there are expressed different views of Confederation and how it has functioned. Such diversity is not unexpected, as Canada does not have one or even two predominant political cultures. Canada possesses 12 political cultures, one for each province and territory, not including the various aboriginal peoples.

I believe Canada's constitutional problems stem much from an inability to recognize this diversity of political cultures as from the ill-conceived, ill-advised attempt at constitutional reform known as Meech Lake. Meech Lake was not an attempt to better the 1982 Constitution. I would have sold our birthright of a proud Canada for a mess of pottage, making Canada into a loose alliance of independent states similar to Germany before their unification. Meech would have left us with a patchwork quilt of federal laws, a Senate beholden to provincial concerns and a Charter of Rights that was not worth anything, as the "notwithstanding" clause overrides it.

The "notwithstanding" clause has to be deleted from the Constitution Act of 1982. It has served not as a check on unwarranted federal intrusions on provincial social policy areas but as a blunt instrument to deny civil rights and liberties to minority language groups. There is no such thing as group language rights, only the rights of the individual. If individuals' rights are denied, then the language group's rights are denied as well.

2250

The institution that best serves as the protector of these rights is the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada is a federal institution and should not have provincially appointed members on its bench. All appointments should be done federally after advisement from the various law societies as to which members are suitable for elevation to the Supreme Court.

Canada has one of the world's most decentralized governments, given the small population and many conflicting legislative bodies in the country. Our country needs fundamental changes in how the House of Commons and the Senate will function. I submit that present electoral rules do not allow for expression of the public's will. Current laws for distribution of electoral districts have led to wide disparities in the population of electoral districts in several regions of Canada.

I would like to propose the following changes to the House of Commons and the Senate: that the House of Commons be 300 seats; that Professor Edward V. Huntington's Harvard 1921 method of equal proportion be used to redistribute seats impartially after each census so as to have the average population per constituency differ

minimally between the provinces, with two exceptions: at the Northwest Territories have two seats and that no province have fewer seats than a territory. There is an enclosed method that will explain how it is done. No seats should differ in population within a province—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up. You have about a minute left. I have been looking at your brief, and you have about another five minutes there, so—

Mr Fogarty: Yes—unless it can be shown that a change in one riding is necessary to ensure a more equitable distribution of votes in the whole province. All ridings are to be as compactly drawn as possible, taking into consideration the physical geography of each province.

I have substantially more issues and concerns I would like to raise, but as time is pressing, I would ask for the consideration of the committee of everything else I have included in my presentation. Thank you for your time and consideration here tonight.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

FÉMININ PLURIEL

The Vice-Chair: Our last group is Féminin pluriel.

Mlle Hébert : J'ai le plaisir ce soir de vous lire des extraits du mémoire préparé par Féminin pluriel, une coalition de femmes francophones qui vivent à Toronto.

Nous sommes fières de vivre en Ontario, province progressiste qui a donné le ton au reste du Canada en adoptant les nombreuses mesures novatrices dans bien des domaines, y compris les services sociaux, les services en français, la protection de l'environnement et l'équité salariale. En tant que femmes et que francophones, nous estimons que les progrès réalisés dans ces dossiers auront des répercussions positives non seulement sur notre vie quotidienne, mais aussi sur celle des générations à venir.

C'est donc avec grand plaisir que nous profitons de cette occasion pour transmettre aux femmes et aux hommes politiques nos pensées sur la question de la place de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

C'est avec tristesse que nous entendons quotidiennement des Canadiennes et des Canadiens de tous les coins du pays reprendre un discours qui, au lieu de favoriser l'entente entre provinces et entre groupes linguistiques, perpétue le climat de méfiance qui sévit actuellement. En effet, les expressions «Canada anglais» et «Canada français» entre autres, nient l'existence d'une importante minorité dans l'une et l'autre des régions désignées par ces étiquettes. Selon cette vision non seulement simpliste mais fautive, les deux groupes linguistiques officiels seraient séparés par des frontières provinciales. Cette attitude traduit un manque de respect, conscient ou non, envers les gouvernements provinciaux comme le nôtre qui ont reconnu officiellement les droits de leur population francophone.

Elle témoigne également un manque de respect envers ceux et celles qui réussissent à relever le défi de conserver leur identité culturelle en situation minoritaire.

En adoptant la Loi de 1986 sur les services en français, le gouvernement de l'Ontario a amorcé la reconnaissance officielle des droits des francophones. Nous estimons qu'il devrait concrétiser l'engagement qu'il a pris envers les francophones et soutenir le vouloir vivre des francophones au Canada. À cette fin, le gouvernement de cette province devrait donner le ton en amorçant publiquement et ouvertement les préparatifs pour instaurer le bilinguisme officiel.

Nous avons également quelques recommandations sur d'autres questions, notamment le système d'éducation en Ontario. Les recommandations sont contenues dans le document et nous vous invitons à les lire. Il n'est pas nécessaire de les lire en détail à ce moment.

Nous recommandons cependant que soit créé le plus rapidement possible un réseau d'enseignement exclusivement francophone dont les Franco-Ontariens auraient l'entière gestion.

Sur la question des services de garde, nous sommes particulièrement sensibles aux lacunes. Nous croyons que le gouvernement devrait adopter une politique en matière de garde d'enfants qui garantirait l'accès universel à des garderies publiques ou à un but non lucratif.

Nous croyons également que l'Ontario pourrait assumer un rôle de chef de file dans l'alphabétisation de ses citoyennes et de ses citoyens, notamment les francophones qui représentent une forte proportion des analphabètes fonctionnels de cette province.

Bien que l'Ontario soit effectivement la plus riche des provinces canadiennes, elle souffre, comme ses sœurs, de coupures budgétaires pratiquées par le gouvernement fédéral. Or, c'est justement en sa qualité de province privilégiée que l'Ontario doit prendre toutes les mesures possibles pour combattre ces mesures draconiennes et empêcher le gouvernement fédéral de sabrer dans les services gérés par les provinces. Nous devons prendre les mesures nécessaires pour garantir un revenu minimum à tous et assurer que les soins de santé, les services sociaux et l'éducation n'accusent aucun recul.

Nous recommandons donc que le gouvernement ontarien donne le ton en faisant pression auprès du gouvernement fédéral pour que celui-ci maintienne son soutien financier aux soins de santé, aux services sociaux et à l'éducation.

Le Vice-Président : Je vous remercie beaucoup. That concludes our hearings for this evening from Toronto. We would like to thank everybody for their presentations and we will be back into regular sittings again tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock sharp. Until tomorrow morning.

The committee adjourned at 2258.

CONTENTS

Thursday 28 February 1991

Korean Canadian Youth Federation	C-875
Chinese Canadian National Council	C-878
Vince Marchildon, Basile Dorion	C-880
National Action Committee on the Status of Women, Unemployment Insurance Working Group	C-881
Organization of South Asian Canadians	C-884
Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, Ontario Region	C-887
Ontario Committee, Communist Party of Canada	C-890
Martin Silva	C-892
Aboriginal Urban Alliance of Ontario	C-893
Ontario Metis and Aboriginal Association	C-895
Indian Commission of Ontario (Aboriginal Peoples)	C-895
Ad Hoc Committee of Women and the Constitution	C-901
Afternoon sitting	C-906
Science for Peace	C-906
Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto	C-908
Toronto Injured Workers' Advocacy Group, Ontario Network of Injured Workers' Groups	C-910
Canadian Parents for French (Ontario)	C-913
Michel Oullette	C-915
Citizens for Public Justice	C-917
Canadian Bar Association – Ontario, Association du Barreau canadien – Ontario	C-918
Ontario Teachers' Federation	
Fédération des enseignantes et des enseignants de l'Ontario	C-921
Intercede	C-924
Council of Canadians	C-924
National Congress of Italian Canadians	C-927
Canadian National Society of the Deaf-Blind	C-930
Coalition of Visible Minority Women, Congress of Black Women of Canada	C-932
Ontario Federation of Students	
Fédération des étudiants et des étudiantes de l'Ontario	C-933
Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation	
Fédération des enseignantes-enseignants des écoles secondaires de l'Ontario	C-935
Evening sitting, Committee room 151	C-938
Michael Dean	C-938
Robert Maule	C-935
Dorothy Whitworth	C-935
Barbara Yurkoski	C-941
Willowdale NDP Federal Constituency Association	C-942
Julio Schincariol	C-942
David Louie	C-944
Alex Perlman	C-945
Gordon Turnbull	C-946
Patrick Kutney	C-947
John Sommers	C-948
Ron Lamb	C-949
Helen and Bill Robson	C-949
Vera Walton	C-951
Dudley Francis	C-951
First Nations Student Union of Osgoode Hall Law School	C-952
Rudy Lak	C-953
Martin Jaeger	C-954
Kirk MacGregor	C-955

Robert Arnone	C-955
Patricia Semach	C-956
Pierre Bevalant	C-957
Richard Comber	C-958
Robert Mortimer	C-958
Albert Tichel	C-959
Asper Kujavsky	C-960
Frank Naccarato	C-960
Adedeus Lipinski	C-962
Lewis Eisen	C-962
Tim Whitehead, Daniel Schwanen	C-963
Monica Stritzky	C-964
Shaul Ezer	C-964
Harold Beatson	C-965
James Boles	C-966
Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists	C-966
John Hopkins	C-967
Edith Silver	C-968
Nola Crew	C-969
Bill Belliveau	C-969
Stephen Johnson	C-970
Bozena Kolar Eisenhauer	C-972
Adjournment	C-974
Evening sitting, Committee room 1	C-975
Paul Pakeman	C-975
Michael McCutcheon	C-975
Robert E. Wright	C-976
David Murray	C-977
John Pope	C-978
Mary Anne Atell	C-979
Philip Walke	C-980
Martin Drover	C-981
Daniel Galaski	C-982
Lawrence New Democratic Party Riding Association	C-983
Alain Pechon	C-984
George Robert Shaw	C-985
Daniel Chevrier	C-987
Isobel Allen	C-987
Barry Brown	C-988
Chai Kalevar	C-989
Ron Leitch	C-990
Phoenix Association	C-991
Melville Phipps	C-992
Reta McWhinnie	C-993
Henry Raston	C-994
Grant Walker Gunness	C-994
Joe Armstrong	C-995
Lois Bedard	C-996
Italian Canadians for Progress	C-997
Al Trent	C-998
Maria Greifeneder	C-999
Carla Berg	C-999
Dave Boese	C-1000
Bloor West Village Voters	C-1001
Robert S. W. Campbell	C-1002
Trudy Bretzer	C-1003
David Fogarty	C-1004
Féminin pluriel	C-1005
Adjournment	C-1005

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)

Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

Stockwell, Chris (Etobicoke West PC) for Mr Eves

Wilson, Gary (Kingston and The Islands NDP) for Ms Harrington

Also taking part: Cunningham, Dianne E. (London North PC)

Clerk pro tem:

Brown, Harold

Freedman, Lisa

Deller, Deborah

Staff:

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



C-20 1991

C-20 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Friday 1 March 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le vendredi 1 mars 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Friday 1 March 1991

The committee, in part, met at 0921 in room 151.

The Chair: If I can call the meeting to order and just explain so that you people who are here with us this morning in the audience, the audience which will no doubt be growing as the day goes on, that we are of course here in Toronto at the Legislative Building, and we are the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, or actually one half of the committee, because what we have done today, as we did last night, was to divide the committee into two sections, with the other half in another meeting room here in the Legislative Building, as a way to ensure that we could hear as many of the groups and individuals as wanted to be heard here in Toronto.

What we will also be doing for people who will be following us over the parliamentary channel is that the coverage of the meetings this morning and this afternoon will be alternating roughly every hour between the two halves of the committee. Then both sequences in complete duration will be shown, we believe, Monday and Tuesday so that people will have an opportunity to see both parts of both meetings this morning and this afternoon as well as the entire meetings of both committees on Monday and Tuesday of next week.

THE CANADIAN HEARING SOCIETY

The Chair: So with that let me proceed. The first group on our list apparently has not arrived so we will ask the second group on our list, the Canadian Hearing Society, to come forward and make its presentation. And as just asked, I will remind people as we go through the day of the 15-minute time lines that we have allowed for presentations by groups; and, if possible, we would like within that to also have some time left for questions by the members of the committee.

Ms Boshes: Thank you all for giving me an opportunity to speak to you. I just want to point out that the Canadian Hearing Society is a social service agency that provides services to deaf, deafened and hard-of-hearing people in this province. We provide a variety of services that are listed in this paper; I will not go through them. Contact with the consumers on our board give us a lot of experience with the issues that relate to this group, and we feel that we can bring some of these concerns to you from our agency viewpoint.

In previous debates, special-needs groups have presented their concerns, those being the native Canadians and the francophone Canadians. We have a concern that there are many different special-interest groups—deaf, deafened and hard-of-hearing—being different communities that have special needs, and we would hope that any future vision of Confederation protects the rights of all special-needs groups and that the Charter of Rights is preserved because it already provides some legal protection.

We would hope that as one of the special needs that has been pointed out, the language-rights issue, that the committee would recommend and support the deaf community's goal to have its language rights protected. Culturally, deaf people use American sign language and langue des signes québécois as their language of communication, and we feel that this language needs to be protected in the Constitution. This would ensure that educational approaches would be available in these languages, and that has been a very big concern for us and the deaf community and a demand of the deaf community in Ontario which has recently been recognized, but we would like to see this protected in the Constitution.

We also support maintaining national standards, especially when it comes to health, social services, vocational rehabilitation and employment equity. We feel that the current erosion of transfer payments jeopardizes maintaining these standards. How can the provinces be expected to live up to the expectations if they do not have the funds to do that? So we feel that the government should be increasing transfer payments instead of reducing them.

With respect to employment equity legislation, the Canadian Hearing Society was part of a group that pushed for stronger legislation on a federal level. Our desire for mandatory targets and time lines was not implemented in the federal legislation, and we feel that this is a concern. We would like to see stronger legislation, and we feel that the province can play a leadership role when it has its opportunity to implement employment equity legislation.

Our biggest concern, and I think you have heard this from the community itself, is the crisis in sign language interpreters. Right now we need to be creative and do what we can to end this crisis. One of the problems relates to the fact that people do not recognize the role that a sign language interpreter plays, nor do they want to pay for this service. An example is with the OHIP. There is no mechanism under the fee schedule to pay for a sign language interpreter, so a deaf person wanting to go to a doctor cannot expect that the doctor would provide an interpreter. It is true that the Canadian Hearing Society, through its Ontario interpreter services, gets some funding from the Ministry of Community and Social Services to provide some staff interpreters. We have 14 positions around the province, and even if we provide that service free, that certainly falls short of equal access to medical services for these citizens. So we are very concerned about this as well as the lack of access in many other areas.

How can we achieve employment equity without interpreters? If you want to go for a job interview, if you need to be present at a staff meeting, if you want to participate at all in your workplace and you use a sign language interpreter, that is your means for access. So we feel that there has to be much more recognition of the right of people to

have an interpreter, and government has to accept responsibility to provide funding to pay for interpreters.

Furthermore, we have been offering an innovative program to provide some training for interpreters and we have been searching for the past three years through the federal and provincial governments to obtain funding for this program. Unfortunately, we do not seem to fit in any of the prescribed funding formulas and no one has yet come up with a creative solution for us. We are being forced to close this program, which just further limits the expansion of interpreters and adds to the crisis.

We are also concerned about the rigid use of definition when it is applied to deaf, deafened and hard-of-hearing people. Some deaf people believe strongly about their cultural links and feel that their language and values make them a viable culture. However, government departments insist that they are a medical disability, and the philosophy that applies to the disabled groups in most of the government departments is integration. Many of the deaf people who use sign language want specialized services, and there is a catch-22, because if they are not deemed as a culture but deemed as a medical disability they are expected to use the mainstream programs, and the specialized services that are required where they can communicate directly with the service provider are not available to them. So we ask that the groups themselves be able to designate whether they want to be treated as a culture or as a disability and that all these options be available. Specialized services need to be there for those people who want to use them.

0930

A concern right now is with mental health services. We have one designated program in Toronto, called Connect, and we have had a semblance of a program at the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry which has had a mandate to provide services on a provincial and even Canada-wide basis. We hear that that program is going to close. If that closes, the only people who will have access to specialized mental health services who use sign language are people in Toronto. That is very sad. There are people all over this province who need these kinds of services. Something has to be done about that.

We are also concerned that the specialized services that are required by hard-of-hearing and deafened individuals receive some recognition. For example, we have a seniors' outreach program where we provide service to seniors who are losing their hearing and help them maintain their independence. Again, there is difficulty in getting funding for this in some areas. People say: "Oh, you don't need specialized services. The other home support programs can provide services." And they do not recognize that there is a specialty in providing devices and educating the families about what it is to be hard of hearing, what it means to be losing your hearing, and this is a valued service.

There are other support services, specialized services, such as computerized note-taking, oral interpreters for oral deaf people, and so on, and these need to be given recognition and there needs to be funds available to provide access to the groups that need them in whatever way they need them.

There are many issues that we could bring forward, and I know that this committee cannot deal with all of

these issues. There are such things as early identification. Some deaf children are not being identified until they are two years old and they have lost those critical years for language learning. We need more preschool and language-training programs. Parents need support and so on.

I thank you for the opportunity to come here and talk to you. I know people around this table have other commitments and sit on other committees, so the Canadian Hearing Society would be happy to consult with you in any of these areas that you are working in to make sure that these groups have an opportunity to be represented in your other jurisdictions as well.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for that very comprehensive presentation. One question that I have for you is regarding employment equity programs and whether you think that it can be successful without the foundation of interpreting. Is there anything that you think regarding that issue that we as a committee should be concentrating on?

Ms Boshes: Again, for employment equity to be successful we need the sign language interpreters, you are right, because how can someone have equal access and equal opportunities to employment? It is an issue because, I guess as you know personally, the kind of interpreting that is required at times depends on the position that an individual holds, and often people are prevented from moving ahead, getting promotions, taking on supervisory or management positions because they do not have access to that kind of interpreting or their employer cannot afford or does not understand that he should provide that kind of interpreting. We have a lot of that ourselves at the Canadian Hearing Society. We want to promote deaf managers; we work to promote deaf managers. We have an opportunity to provide as much as possible an accessible environment because our staff can learn sign language, but in other organizations and agencies an interpreter and access to interpreting is essential.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms Boshes: Thank you.

EAST INDIAN WORKERS ASSOCIATION OF CANADA

The Chair: Could I call next the East Indian workers?

Mr Gosal: I would like to display my appreciation and my organization's appreciation that this process is a very good process. It is much better than we have seen in the past from 1987 till 1990: 11 people locked themselves in a room and brought a solution for Canada. It did no work, and we did say at that time that it would not work. We were working against that type of thing. What today we started in Ontario—it is also going in Canada—probably will bring fruitful results.

Just introducing what the East Indian Workers Association is doing: At this moment most of its work is civic participation. The new Canadians, we are urging them to become Canadian and leave everything else they brought from home; that is for the people at home. We have boxes in most of the labour movement; some are in the name of East Indians, the others are in the name of south Asians. When we come to politics, we do not stick to one political

party. Which party fits to individuals, they are working in those political parties.

But that is an introduction. These notes were prepared when I was asked to present East Indians' concerns individually. Then, thanks to the wisdom of the committee, we were asked, "Bring your concern as from the group."

Canadian unity is tied to regional autonomy. A strong federal government does not mean complete centralization. There are certain powers which may be decentralized to the provinces. All provinces may not have equal powers, but an equitable system must be worked out between the federal government and the provinces as well as among the provincial governments. Canadians are required to respect, fundamentally, language and cultural duality; also aboriginal, women's and visible minority concerns are to be embedded in the Constitution. The Canadian Constitution needs overhauling—everybody says that—therefore Canadians must learn to accept change. Without accepting change, we may not accept the new ideas.

I was disturbed by French-only signs in Quebec, Quebec flag-stamping in Cornwall and English-only language resolutions by many municipalities of Ontario. It was distressing that the above incidents took place when the delicate negotiations and ratifications of the Meech Lake accord were in progress.

I understand the frustration of French Canadians in the past. The minorities even are suffering at the hands of the majority today. Inequity in economic, social, educational and political fields is disheartening. Now, French Canadians are not the targets—other groups are—at least not in Quebec. French Canadians in Quebec should be able to provide leadership to other provinces in Canada in equitable treatment to all Quebecers. Experiences are the best teachers of humanities. Oppressed people, after achieving equity, must offer to work together for others. I am sure Canadians should and would create unity from diversity.

Some federal powers the federal government must retain—that is "must"—such as foreign affairs, defence and security, communication and transportation, finance, revenue and economics, environment, education, health and welfare and immigration. That is because you have to have some type of national standards. Unless the federal government has these powers, they will not be able to set the standards such as health, welfare, education and other environment, as I said.

Other powers may be shared by the provinces. This may vary from province to province. Provincial veto system for our constitutional changes should be replaced with the national referendum system. The Senate, of course, can be called upper House, elected upper House, not a selected one as present.

Let me talk about multiculturalism. Multiculturalism is a horticultural garden which produces different types of flowers; it can be said, a rainbow. Any plant that is not looked after equitably will produce thorns instead of flowers. At present, grants are given to the different groups for their cultural developments, not to learn from their culture. It would be nice if we use those funds to learn from each other's culture, ie, complete integration of cultures. For

time to come, by implementing the above, there will be no different groups in Canada but all Canadians. As I say today, I am a proud Canadian, but I am a Sikh.

Indeed, we have moved a long way, ie, Chinese are not thrown in Fraser River as in 1885. Sikhs are no more greeted with bullets at Vancouver port as was the case in 1914 with the Komagata Maru boat, but a long way to go. Canadian minorities will not tolerate window dressings any more, and neither will tokenism satisfy them. We mean business, like the founding cultures.

I just want to drop a note here, redistribution of wealth, that came to my mind when the federal government imposed a 3% ceiling on the federal civil servants for three years, where they had a hefty raise because they have the power in their hands. I think those powers should be taken out and some type of system should be embedded in our fundamental laws of the country. As I say, recent trends indicate that the rich are getting richer at the expense of the middle class. It is important to revise the tax system and include in the fundamental laws of the land that minimum taxes must be imposed on the rich and corporations. Canadian economic independence must be the goal, which is, I think, withering away.

Human rights in Ontario: Though we are talking about Confederation, I think Ontario has a leading role to play to show there are concerns about human rights in this province. Human rights are being eroded in Ontario. I do not have to spend much time on this. I refer your attention to read Toronto Star stories. I am attaching one sample as an example re "Job-Seekers Facing Silent Discrimination," Toronto Star of 17 February 1991. There are many other articles on racism published in the press. There are deep-rooted problems in the Ontario civil service as an institution regarding human rights and race relations. I, a worker in Ontario civil service, cannot speak in public on the specific examples, which is what is happening in Ontario civil service.

I would recommend a sincere inquiry, not like another inquiry which was held recently and nobody knows what happened to it—a sincere inquiry on this subject. And as I say, these notes to speak were prepared for me. I voluntarily give my services, volunteer services, not paid services, to Human Resources Secretariat of Ontario, which I told them personally as well.

Bargaining unit workers are innocent and sincere in race relations. I may repeat that. Bargaining unit workers are innocent and sincere in race relations. It can be seen from the local and provincial leadership of the Ontario Public Service Employees Union, part of which is from the minorities. Even the OPSEU president is from the minority. I am proud of my peers who always have elected me their leader in one form or the other. At present, I am the president of the largest local of Ministry of Correctional Services with Steve Offer. No, I am sorry, he was the Solicitor General. Some top executives make lame excuses to deal with elected leaders who happen to be from a visible minority—it is still going on—of our union. They are at a pain to accept us and negotiate with us on white workers' behalf. They have questions. That is a shame. Many active unionists from visible minorities are blacklisted and they

are branded as radicals. Their only fault is they are fighting for their fellow workers' rights, and they will carry on.

Let me talk about employment equity, which I call window dressing. For years, employment equity has been much talked about. Finally, it appears that mandatory employment equity will soon be legislated. We applaud the Ontario government for this courageous step. It is recognition that our society acknowledges its inherent weaknesses and that drastic remedies are sometimes required to address such problems. The foul odour of discrimination, whether systemic or overt, must be cleansed from our midst. Employment equity legislation recognizes that at the heart of barriers facing minorities is the unwillingness of major institutions, the offenders, to become serious about tackling discrimination.

Our primary concern is the implementation of mandatory employment equity legislation. As you see, we cannot even find who to head the employment equity commission from Ontario: I do not want to say too much on that. We have observed with sadness the problem with existing statutes such as the Ontario Human Rights Code Act and Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, where the goal has been strangled by the ineffective means enacted to achieve that goal. The victim becomes frustrated, facing further abuse as suddenly he or she has to justify their rights to achieve redress. Many of us have experienced the phenomenon of blacklisting or allegations of radicalism merely because we have attempted to enforce our rights.

As I said, the East Indian Workers Association is not working in isolation, it is working with the labour movement. I want to talk about the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act; not much, but a little bit. As presently structured, the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act severely restricts the scope of collective bargaining. The Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act gives the employer the exclusive right to determine, in section 7 and subsection 18(1)—there are 10 items: organization; complement, employment, appointment and assignment; the classification; work methods and procedures; discipline, suspension and dismissal; kinds and locations of equipment; the merit system; training and development; appraisal; superannuation. That is where the employers can do whatever they want and get away with it.

With the above, employers misuse their powers. Workers and the institutions suffer from ineffectiveness and inefficiency. Although the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act gives an employee the right to grieve against some of the above scopes, again, any employee who grieves is classed radical and is blacklisted. On top of that, the burden of proof is on the grieving employee because of CECBA. If that employee happens to be from a visible minority, then hell breaks loose upon him or her.

The Chair: Sir, if you would sum up, please. We are at the end of the time.

Mr Gosal: Well, summing up, I will leave that there. I want some redressing. You have got the brief notes.

We would love to see Canada independent of the world grouping and neutral, Canada in the world, which I saw when I decided to come to Canada. Canada was much

respected in 60 countries I visited in my life. Today, Canada is not respected. Mr Chairman, we would like, through you, to give this indication to the federal constitutional committee which is the Spicer commission.

0950

We have told Spicer. Fortunately, we will be giving them that type of brief.

Thanks very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We will move to the next group.

HINDU SOLIDARITY AND CONTINUING COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS

The Chair: From the Hindu Solidarity and Continuing Committee on Race Relations, Mr Kalevar. Mr Kalevar, we need to be clear about something. I gather you appeared last night before the other half of the committee.

Mr Kalevar: Yes, I wanted to catch the other half, on behalf of the groups.

The Chair: Okay, you appeared as an individual last night.

Mr Kalevar: That is right.

The Chair: And you are appearing here on behalf of these groups?

Mr Kalevar: That is right. My brief is on behalf of the group. First, I should tell you that since I talked to the clerk, I have been in contact with the peace residents of Queen's Park, peace campers, and they have also endorsed parts of my brief. My brief is entitled Canada, the Superpower of Peace and World Public Opinion.

Perhaps you can understand that I am occasionally recognized as the new Canadian Indian. Five hundred years ago, Christopher Columbus was lost looking for me. Well here I am. So recommendation 1, to you as a committee. The Ontario government should boycott the celebration of the discovery of America planned for 1992; instead, a recovery project be planned for the natives of Ontario and natives of Ontario get their due, self-government, as they should have got a long time ago.

Almost a decade ago, I had the occasion to hear an interesting poem at the native Canadian centre on Spadina. It goes something like this:

The white man came to our land
With the Bible in his hand
And now we have the Bible
And he has the land.

I normally do not wear this many T-shirts, but today I wish to perform before you a bit of a political striptease. I am what you call a T-shirt junkie, so bear with my T-shirt as I peel them off.

Recently, the Ontario Legislature chose to stick to the Lord's Prayer. I suggest that the Legislature follow the children of Ontario and follow prayers from all religious faiths.

Recommendation 3: We have had a problem with the human rights commission for a long time. I believe the Ontario Human Rights Commission should be above partisan politics so let the human rights commission report to an all-party committee of the House, not to a minister of the

rown. In these days of jihad and just war, it is good for Ontario institutions to be not associated with any of those divisive symbols.

Recommendation 4: that section 16 of the Ontario Evidence Act, which basically gives primacy to the Bible in Ontario courts, be amended to be consistent with the charter. In my experience as somebody who has been challenging the use of the Bible in the courts, we have found that the justice system is rigid and very inaccessible. What is more important, the constitutional rights of Ontarians and Canadians are largely unaffordable to most Ontarians. It is only probably those who are members of the Granite Club who can really exercise their constitutional rights.

However, in spite of the justice system, constitutions are important and we should be looking at what kind of Constitution we should have. A Constitution is a document which does, in my opinion, three things. It is a bit of a history book. It is a bit of a trade deal in which we get profit potential and a road map for the future.

As a history book, we have come a long way from 1867 to 1991. At least one presentation previously I heard suggested that Canada has three founding nations, English, French and the natives. Well, it is a good start after Oka, but we still have a long way to go for all the other multicultural communities that are in Canada. I hope we do not allow these kinds of incidents to be repeated in Canada again. I am proud to be a Canadian, for Canada has been a participant in all UN peacekeeping forces. I do not wish to see a UN peacekeeping force located in Canada. I think we should start addressing the unity issues quickly.

As a trade deal, we should get on with the national unity questions and remove delineation of many of the provinces.

As a road map, the Constitution is a guide to our succeeding generations. It is the brightest light we can provide for them to face the dark, dim, uncertain but common future of all.

Canada is geographically located in the tough neighbourhood of the two superpowers. We cannot afford to split up and become two apple republics of the north, or 12 apple republics to the north.

We also get our cultural and linguistic bearing from the two imperial forces of the past. Remember, British, French, US, USSR are all veto-yielding powers. Out of this tough neighbourhood has come Canada, but Canada is a democrat at United Nations. That is again something to be proud of.

Canada has generally been generous to refugees. I believe, except for Brian Mulroney's Middle East muddle and his calling of the Parliament for a boatload of people on the east coast, Canada has done well generally.

I come from a country which extended from sea to sea and was multicultural, multilingual, multiracial. I hope to live in a country like that. As far as language is concerned, in India, the language is a matter of provincial jurisdiction, but education is a matter of national or federal jurisdiction.

I wrote to the Band C commission, the Bélanger-Campeau commission, saying that I wanted to appear before it. Of course, as a non-Quebecker, I did not get very far. Again, if they are going to hear only Quebecers and if they want to decide on the future of Quebec, let them

understand that when they decide on the future of Quebec, they are also deciding on the future of Canada. As a Canadian living outside of the province, I strenuously object to them deciding on the future of Canada when the rest of the Canadians have not been heard.

1000

If Quebec as a province can claim to speak and decide on the future of Canada, will you tomorrow allow the Northwest Territories to do the same? Perhaps I should point out that at least the native view of Quebec is well presented in this map. As you can see—these maps were not made by me; these were bought at political functions—French Quebec is the belly button here and the rest of the land is still native. I hope it is clear that a country without a land is an impossibility. In the view of many natives, Quebec, if it separates and becomes independent, will be the largest squatter colony on the face of the earth. I think that is something even Quebecers will have to contend with.

We are talking about diversity. I believe we need amicable diversity, but a diversity from the United States, the free trade agreement. I think that is what is perhaps best required.

Why should Canadians stay together then? Very simply, we have to face the global responsibilities in a tough neighbourhood, and there are not many countries who are in a position like Canada to do so. We are a member of the Commonwealth, of la Francophonie, the Organization of American States and the Granite Club of the world, the G-7. With our membership spanning all these important organizations, we are an important part of the glue of the world and we have an important role to play in planning the common future of the world.

This particular part has been, as I said, endorsed by the peace campers at Queen's Park and this is what I bring to you as a constitution of peace.

Let Ontario state unequivocally at constitutional talks on behalf of the peace movement of Canada that the Canadian Constitution shall not permit Canadian troops leaving Canada under any flag except the UN flag, and I do not mean a UN resolution passed at the behest of the United States and the war conducted by a smiling American general, in violation of all the UN charter provisions of how to conduct a war under the UN charter, assuming that that is the last resort necessary. Second, our Constitution shall not permit Canadian armed forces to enter the unceded territories of the natives at home. There is no reason why these two things cannot be followed by Canada.

If and when there is a war abroad and Canada has to take part, let Canadian participation begin by providing medical facilities on both sides of the war and let Canadian transportation knowhow be used to help the fleeing refugees from the war zones. Let that be the Canadian role abroad. Canada can then begin to see itself and project itself as the superpower of peace, which I believe no nation is capable of doing right now—and certainly no one is doing right now—and Canada has the capacity and the knowhow to do it, if only we do not elect Brian Mulroney again.

Again, let Ontario fight for a federal government with the capacity to establish and enforce uniform national standards, especially in the areas of environment, resources and waste.

Let Ontario help support an international satellite network for verification and reconnaissance of national armed forces, but reporting directly to the United Nations. There is no reason why we should be reporting it to our neighbour and playing the tail end of the dog.

Let Ontario, with Bob Rae as Premier and, perhaps, providing a ray of hope on the national scene, extend itself in asking the United States, the USSR, France, and Britain to give up their vetoes.

The Chair: Mr Kalevar, you are going to have to sum up, please.

Mr Kalevar: Okay. Last but not least, as part of the important part of the glue of the world, I think, let Canadians dare to become not only just the glue of the world but the Krazy-Glue of the world and plan the common future of the world, which as a totality is in danger. I hope you will take this message seriously and give it your due consideration and pass it on to the national and, perhaps, international forum, where it needs to be heard.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Kalevar. Could we move on, then, to the next group?

WOMEN WORKING WITH IMMIGRANT WOMEN

The Chair: Women Working with Immigrant Women? If you would, madam, when you start, just start with your name so that we have that for the record.

I can just say, also, for people who may be following us over the parliamentary channel, that we have switched now to coverage of this half of the committee, the committee of this morning being split into two groups to allow us to hear as many organizations and individuals as possible.

Ms Loucas: Good morning. My name is Salome Loucas and I am from Women Working with Immigrant Women. I have my presentation written down and I believe it will be made available to you, so parts I am going to read; parts I am just going to say what I have to say.

I would like to start by saying how we understand the Constitution of a country. What we understand a Constitution of a country to be is the founding document that sets out the fundamental principles which underlie the state. Most important, it embodies the country's national identity and it reflects the values that people share and which define their relations.

1010

In its present form and content, the Canadian Constitution reflects colonial values—and I am sure you must have heard this a million times—and it cannot be used as a national unifying tool, because it ignores the plurality that compounds the elements of history, origins and languages of the Canadian people, and these are the elements that are commonly used in defining a nation. If unchanged, the Canadian Constitution conditions the Canadian state and nation to racism, discrimination, and continuous crisis.

Because we believe that what unites nations are their history, their language and the values that people share, before we redistribute powers and redefine new identities we should decide what values we want to embody in these new identities and what histories they will validate.

Also, if we want democracy to emerge out of today's crisis, we should remember that democracy cannot be built on the exclusion of people and their interests. Such democracy will not survive the pressure from within, pressure that will be applied by those excluded. I would like to remind you that it was this pressure that caused democracy to collapse in its cradle in ancient Greece. I am of Greek origin and I know very well that history. From that democracy, which serves as a model to today's democracies around the world, there were excluded 300,000 slaves who were of Greek descent because that democracy was designed for citizens only, and only those who owned property and could afford to finance an army had the right to citizenship and the right to vote.

Similarly today in Canada, the same model of democracy serves the interests and benefits only of those voting blocs of the Canadian society which dominate economically, politically and culturally. We feel it is important to relearn Canadian history, because the past created the present, and the present will become past and is going to design the future.

The Canadian state was founded on racism and exclusion, and racism has been perpetuated throughout its history. It was founded by the British and French colonizers, and the ground rules were set to consolidate their powers and to promote their interests. This resulted in the destruction of the economies, governing traditions and cultures of the first nations and in the genocide of the peoples whose resistance was overpowered by advanced armaments and nothing else. This destruction was used as a proof to confirm the superiority of the colonizers' governing tradition and to justify their claim to be the founding nations.

The binational identity that is embodied in the Canadian Constitution is the product of that destruction and caters to the racist mentality and values of Canadian society. This identity was further preserved by the Immigration Act which was introduced to select the populations that Canada needed. The effort to keep Canada white is demonstrated by the history of Canadian immigration policies and regulations. Examples of these policies and regulations are the head tax on Chinese immigrants—and Canadian governments made millions of dollars from that head tax—the continuous journey from the country of origin regulation which was introduced to stop the entry of East Indian immigrants, and the regulation concerning undesirables which included the class of immigrants belonging to any race unsuited to the climate of Canada and which was introduced to stop the entry of black Americans.

These policies and regulations were developed on the principle that would-be immigrants had no fundamental human right to enter Canada, nor did immigrants have the right to Canadian citizenship once they were living in Canada. Immigration to Canada and Canadian nationalization were privileges, not rights. It was on this basis that the security system that emphasized virtually complete administrative discretion with no judicial or independent review and no recognition of natural justice for the individual affected could operate quietly with little public notice. Based on this principle, immigrants were deported, segregated, denied the right to organize into unions and the right to vote.

It is this principle, which can be identified also in today's immigration policies, that continues to cater to the racist mentality of Canadian society. Accordingly, equality and human rights for racial minority Canadians are not priority constitutional items. This is because white Canadians, whatever their origin, see racial minority Canadians as outsiders, as immigrants, whether they have lived in this country for generations or whether they just got off the boat.

This mentality is demonstrated by the central preoccupation in constitutional discussions which attempt to define the relations between English-speaking Canada and Quebec only, and from the perspective of Canadians of British and French descent. This power struggle is defined by these groups to be the national question. All other peoples, their issues and interests, are put aside so as not to distract the reaching of an agreement on what the two groups define to be fundamental for the future of the country. With this approach one can only say that the mental colonization of the Canadian people continues, and these values will be reflected in the new societies.

To initiate the democratization of people's mentality and relations we need to adopt an inclusive approach. Racial and ethnic minorities need not have to compete for equality or have to prove they have a legitimate case before the issues we raise are included on the political agenda or in the discussions. This practice of putting our communities through this exercise suggests that we do not understand the issues, the Canadian politics, and we do not have the interest of Canada and her people in mind. If we were true Canadians, according to this suggestion, we would understand what is important and we would not have a different perspective.

This perspective has been developed from our economic status within Canadian society and the lack of political representation of our interests. This experience composes our history, which is part of the unwritten Canadian history. These histories are not acknowledged in conventional history books because acknowledging these histories would mean validating the economic contribution and political struggles of racial minorities. To validate these histories would mean addressing the demands of racial minorities for equality.

The demand that was put forward during the Meech Lake discussions by ethnic and racial minority groups to include multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic of Canada had the objective to validate these histories and the cultures that had developed from these struggles. Multiculturalism should not be interpreted to mean protection of foreign cultures and traditions, because these traditions are part of the identity of a few million Canadians of non-British or -French traditions. To suggest that non-British or -French traditions are not Canadian is nothing more than blatant racism.

Another issue that caused controversy during those discussions was the equality clause, section 15 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms was entrenched in the Constitution to protect the rights of the individual. It is, so far, the only written document which is subject to judicial interpretation that could provide protection of human rights for racial and ethnic

minorities. I am sure that people know what section 15 says, so I am not going to read it.

These rights, however, are not guaranteed because of the exceptions under section 33, which reads:

"Parliament or the legislature of a province may expressly declare in an act of Parliament or of the legislature, as the case may be, that the act or a provision thereof shall operate notwithstanding a provision included in section 2 or sections 7 to 15 of this charter."

What this translates into is that as long as a declaration is made, the Parliament or a provincial legislature can enact legislation which could violate these rights included in sections 2 and 7 to 15. According to this, no judicial body has the power to supersede the power of the Parliament. Such a declaration has effect for five years and it can be further re-enacted.

When racial and ethnic minority groups raised the issue that this application of the charter leaves unlimited room for violations of human rights, our concerns were met with the accusation that we were undermining unity in achieving the reaching of a satisfactory agreement on the national question—more simply put, the political future of Quebec.

1020

It is not the intention of racial and ethnic minorities to achieve equality at the expense of others. We are asked, though, to put our lives on hold indefinitely as a guarantee that the interests of those who are more Canadian than we are will materialize.

It appears that section 15 of the charter was included only to beautify the Constitution and to quiet the voices of minority peoples. It is nothing more than an attempt to ease the conscience of a racist society without endangering it.

The only protection against the violation of minority rights under these sections of the charter would be public opinion, something that racial minority people learned not to count on.

Recently, because of the war in the Gulf, the harassment of Arab people because of their background association, because of their religion, is an example of how these sections are implemented not by actually introducing legislation but in principle.

Canada has a history of human rights violations of her citizens who were driven to concentration camps and forced labour camps. This experience is shared by the Japanese and Italian Canadians as well as other Canadians of eastern European origin. We are certain that others will follow if there are no changes.

Racial and ethnic minority Canadians want nothing more than the benefit of the protection of the laws of Canada and equality in a society to which we have contributed socially and economically more than our share. The responsibility to deal with racism in Canadian society lies solely on the shoulders of white Canadians, who have to challenge their own values and address their racism.

We may not have given answers to all questions regarding the power struggle between the different levels of government, but this was not our intention. Our position on what we feel strongly about is as follows:

The right of first nations to self-determination is long overdue, and more than recognizing this right, racial and ethnic minorities pledge to work in solidarity with the first nations.

We recognize the right of the people of Quebec to decide their future and we will work in solidarity with the people of Quebec.

We envision a confederation of nations that can peacefully coexist with an English-speaking nation.

The societies we envision building within these nations are pluralistic societies, which means embodying the histories, origins, traditions and values of all peoples of those nations.

With regard to electoral systems, we would like to see a system that allows participation in decision-making and representation of the interests of our communities.

We would like to see a mechanism that would allow people to recall elected representatives who lose the people's support because of their policies or political agenda.

Economic development and planning should meet people's needs first.

In closing, we would like to say that the transition to democracy might be difficult but it cannot be prevented, and the best guide for the democratization of our society is the interest of the people.

Mr Offer: One of the things we are going to be grappling with in our deliberations is what role this province can play in these discussions which are ongoing, and I sense from your presentation that one message seems to come through loud and clear, and that is that the multicultural aspect of the country should be recognized in the Constitution. I am wondering if you can share with us what you feel the role of Ontario should be in these discussions and how it can best work to meet some of the concerns which you have raised in your presentation.

Ms Loucas: I will try to the best of my ability to answer your question.

I think that within the interpretation we give to multiculturalism it has to be recognized as a fundamental characteristic of this country. What Ontario can do—a number of proposals have come from our groups. For example, employment equity is an issue that is very important. We would like to see some mandatory employment equity programs, if that can answer part of your question. It is not an idea; to us, it is a value that has to be embodied in the thinking of the society: that multiculturalism is a benefit, it is an asset to this country.

Ms Churley: I have, I think, a pretty important question to ask you. On your last page you say, "a mechanism that would allow people to recall elected representatives who lose people's support." We hear that a lot, actually, in our travels. We are also hearing it from, for instance, people from the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada. I do not know if you know them as a group, but you can tell by the title what their position is on a lot of things. I have some concerns about the implications of that, particularly if a majority may not necessarily be in the interest sometimes of minority rights. I am just wondering

if you say that because you have enough faith in the majority of the people of Canada to elect the kinds of governments that will protect minority rights. How does that fit in with your agenda?

Ms Loucas: How fast can I say this? For example, if we look at what support our federal government has with the policies and its political agenda, my God, we should have a way of recalling them. When they involve us in their war, when people are around they cannot really have been opposing the GST but still they just shove it down our throats. The percentage of support they have is so low that one wonders, really, whom are they governing?

We should have some kind of mechanism, when governments do not have the support of the people because they introduce policies they never told us, or policies we say we do not want, a mechanism in the Constitution, something there where we could recall them.

Of course, there have to be changes also in the electoral system to make sure that there is representation of the people's interest and it is not—anyway, yes.

Ms Churley: No, I understand what you are saying that minority rights would be protected, because that is my concern about that kind of process you are talking about.

The Chair: It is no doubt an issue that we are going to have to have a lot more discussion about. Thank you very much for your presentation.

VOICE OF WOMEN

The Chair: Could I invite next the Voice of Women? We have, I gather, Kay Macpherson and Anne Adelson.

Ms Macpherson: Thank you, Mr Chairman, for letting us come for what we hope will be a discussion with you rather than a reading at you. My name is Kay Macpherson. I have been in the Voice of Women since practically the beginning, which is 30 years. Anne has been in for a great many years too, along with a number of other activities. I believe you might recognize her from last night.

We do appreciate this opportunity, and all I am going to say—since I cannot read the paper; she is going to do all the hard work—is that the Voice of Women, as you may know, was formed as a women's group to oppose force and violence and war and it has been doing that in various ways for the last 30 years. We put the emphasis first on the peace issue, but during the course of those 30 years we have learned that there is a different perspective which women have upon the subjects of national and international importance. This, joined with the growing feminist movement, if you can use that word, and it seems still dubious at some points—but women do need to have their voices heard because there is a perspective which is missing from particularly, as we see lately, the international scene but also in every aspect of our society.

1030

Our organization was one of the founding organizations of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. We have been involved in other areas of human rights right through our history, and so our concerns for the future of Canada are immense, to say the least. So I am not going to take more time to tell you any of our history.

which you will get in the paper, but ask Anne to pick on the headings in the hope that we can perhaps discuss with you during the course of our presentation any aspects you would like us to clarify. So I will turn it over to Anne Adelson.

Ms Adelson: Thanks very much. We welcome this opportunity to express our voice in the ongoing discussion of the new Canada. Certainly we have always been committed to a new Canada, that is, one that recognizes the shared values we have but builds on it, so the new Canada is not yet and we hope it will be formed.

What we have done in this paper, which we hope you will have a chance to read at some stage, is try to connect our concerns to the questions you have raised, but as we have done that, recognize that the questions you have raised are not necessarily the ones we would have asked. So what we have tried to do is expand on the questions to reflect our perspective. I am going to gloss through it pretty quickly and hopefully leave a little time for questions.

Talking about the values we share as Canadians, we feel there are values we share. Some of them are our commitment to bilingualism and multiculturalism, protection of minority group rights, individual human rights, a commitment to protect the most vulnerable in our society. I think we have to remember that these values are not abstract concepts, but each one of them encapsulates a process of social struggle and development that committed groups and individuals went through to make sure that these values became part of the national consensus as well as becoming entrenched in the laws in the Constitution. So we see the Constitution as part of a process, not as something that is closed, and it should both reflect and give impetus to the process.

We feel that at the very least the Constitution should unequivocally and clearly entrench the values and principles that we have up to now agreed on. That was one of the concerns we had with the Meech Lake accord. Certainly the clauses for equality of women, there was some doubt and some question that these were still in force and we do not want there to be any doubts on any of the issues that we have agreed on. There should not be any place in the Constitution for ambiguity.

But we think the Constitution should do more than just guard the consensus to date; we think it should allow room for growth. So to expand on the question, we would say: How can the values we share as Canadians be reflected in our Constitution in an ongoing way? We feel really that the commitment should be to the process rather than to the product. After all, this is really what democracy is. It is a commitment to a process. And the process should be a public one that encourages the participation of a well-informed and empowered citizenry. We have a lot of items of unfinished business that we think should be, and hope will be, included in future Canadian constitutions. We have but a list of them, and no doubt other groups will have their own. But all we want to say here is that the process needs to include this future growth.

Going on to page 4 and talking about your second question, how we can secure our future in the international economy: Well, for us this is only a fraction of the real

question, which is: How do we with other countries secure our common future internationally? There is a growing awareness that the current frameworks we have for describing, understanding and managing our social and political affairs are inadequate and we do not believe we can treat the international economy, the environment, peace and security, Third World development, any of these, as separate activities and problems that are the mandate of one particular government department or one particular country. All of these activities are aspects of a complex and interconnected whole and need to be dealt with in an integrated way both nationally and internationally. These concepts of interdependence and mutual security and a common future are hopefully going to become part of how we see ourselves in Canada. This is a complicated and complex call for co-ordinated political action and responsibility, and it is really part of a global agenda for change. We just think this needs a lot more work and attention and we have made just a very few suggestions in this regard.

One is that economic decisions must be made in the context of preserving the environment for present and future generations. Of course this is the principle of sustainable development of the Brundtland commission report, which governments are very quick to sign but not so quick to act on to make sure it becomes a political reality.

In *Voice of Women* we have a particular concern with the global problem of militarism. We see it as a dangerous drug that is draining our country and the world of money to do real things. I think if you look at the latest federal budget it is a case in point how money was found to fight the war but not for welfare, health and education. But the problem with this addiction to militarism is that it plays havoc with the economies of the developing world and creates the kind of unjust conditions that lead to unrest, repression, war and more military spending. We really have to break the cycle. I think we need to capitalize on the reputation we had and hopefully still have as a peace-keeper among nations. Let's look at what it would take for Canada to really become a peacemaker and the potential there. I think if we had the political will we could express this orientation in our political and economic decisions.

On the economy we need, I think, to become both more independent in Canada and more interdependent in the world as a whole, not just in the North American fortress, if we could put it that way.

We think there is a need for international laws and agreements to be incorporated into our Canadian Constitution so that these are not just things we agree on and think they sound nice, but we would like them to become part of real political decision-making. We were thinking in terms of the international rights of the child and the forward-looking strategies which were drawn up at the Nairobi conference at the end of the UN decade of women, again, which many countries have put their signature to but have not put into effect. One of the decisions of that forward-looking strategy is for us to say that on negotiating tables 50% of the participants should be women. How I wish that had been put in place before the conditions that we now find ourselves in.

Then we get to the roles of the federal and provincial governments. You ask, "What roles should they play?" and we expand this and say, "and what roles should they not play?" We think this is important because we think that much of the present constitutional crisis and the challenges that you suggested in your report are facing us need not have happened. We believe the Constitution should belong to the people of Canada and we should not allow any governments in Canada to use it to further their own partisan interests. We feel that that is what Meech Lake did. There are certain safeguards against the recurrence of such a fiasco. One of the things you might want to look at are times and procedures for reviewing and amending the Constitution that are established independently of the particular government in power. Switzerland does this, for example, and there are other countries. I think we need to take it out of the realm of partisan political decision-making and back into belonging to the people.

We would like to see a broader perspective offered rather than just the 11 first ministers. I know you have heard other suggestions for a representative citizens' group. We would like to add our support for that as well, and we think it should include women, native people, new immigrants, among others. We think women have particular skills and experiences in decision-making and negotiation, part of what we have had to do in families. We have had to somehow make decisions that make everybody feel comfortable without destroying the family in the meantime. We would like to see these kinds of principles expanded to the global stage as well.

1040

The native people I think have a lot to teach us. It would be kind of nice and interesting for us to make decisions that will last till the seventh generation hence as well, which is what many of them bring into their decision-making. So we very much feel there should be a public input into the whole question of the Constitution.

We believe in a strong central government to do things in Canada and for Canada. You talk about the principle of equalization payments to provinces; well, we have some real concerns about the latest budget that comes down. We feel that if the principle of equalization payments should be entrenched, so, too, should the standards for health care, education and minimum living standards. We do not think the federal government should just be able to decrease the level of the transfer payments in a way that may effectively erode these essential programs and services. We really feel all Canadians have a right to them.

We also believe that our national institutions should be protected in the Constitution. When you look at the history of the CBC and Via Rail and you see how they were designed to promote and protect national unity, we really do not believe any individual government should have the power to withdraw support for them on its own. They should be protected in the Constitution as well.

The Voice of Women questions the right of the federal cabinet on its own to be able to unilaterally commit Canadians to war. We think it is somewhat ironic that the boatload of Sikhs that arrived two years ago was enough of an

emergency to recall Parliament, but the events in Oka and in the Persian Gulf somehow were not.

We, of course, in Voice of Women, have commitment to the principles of preventing war and non-military solutions to conflicts. We realize that, as yet, the rest of Canada has not been ready to make such commitments, but I think most Canadians would acknowledge that going to war, especially in the kind of world we have today, is not a decision to be taken lightly. It has many consequences, very far-reaching consequences. So we believe that the Constitution should be amended to ensure that this decision cannot be made by cabinet order in council. We think it requires at least the approval of the House of Commons. We have some concerns of the Senate, but while it is there, we think this is the kind of decision it should be making on a non-partisan basis, and we think there should be some sort of public input.

Your question 4 dealt with achieving justice for Canada's aboriginal people. We are very pleased this has become a priority of this present Ontario government, and we believe it should also be a priority of other provincial governments and the federal government, and that the necessary commitments to the process should be made in a Canadian Constitution. We would like to extend your question and say: How do we achieve justice and equality for all Canadians? Again, as a women's organization, we were sensitive to the exclusion of explicit commitment to women in the constitutional amendments, and we would not approve any constitutional amendment that failed to make this commitment to equality perfectly clear.

The Meech Lake accord talked about the French-English linguistic duality as a fundamental characteristic. We think as well, the multicultural reality of Canada and the existence and contribution of aboriginal people should also be included as fundamental characteristics of Canada.

And while we recognize the contribution of the Charter of Rights in prohibiting discrimination on the basis of ethnicity, gender, disability—and we would hope it eventually includes sexual orientation as well—we also believe there must be a commitment, not only to rights, but to a more equal voice in decision-making for all of the non-dominant groups in Canadian society. This is important not only because this is right and just, but also we think that the new Canada we spoke about at the beginning is going to need the inclusion of these voices.

When you get to your question of what does Ontario want, we shifted it around and we said: What do we want from Ontario? We think Ontario has a great potential to speak and act for the preservation of Confederation, and we do not believe we can entrust this role either to the present federal government or to the present Quebec government. So please take a leadership role in this. Not only the people of Ontario, but I think the citizens of Canada are behind you in this.

We would like Ontario to speak up for the involvement of the public in any future constitutional issues. As a little sideline on that, we think this process is a good one. We know that there are groups and individuals who have had complaints about being left out. Perhaps you should speak up for the need that people have to talk. Ask for an extension

of the time line; do something to let people's voices be heard. There is a very strong need for Canadians to be heard.

Last, we would like to see Ontario—and we think we have a historical moment of great potential here—to be a role model for Canada in the way it deals with internal issues and also those affecting the rest of Canada and the world. So we invite you to take on that leadership role. You have our support in that, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to you.

The Chair: Thank you very much for a comprehensive presentation. We will be reading the brief in detail. Let me just also make one brief comment with respect to the process that you have touched on a couple of times. As I think you heard me say, Ms Adelson, yesterday, we recognize very clearly that this is only the first step for us, as a committee and as a Legislature, in an ongoing process. We will be looking very clearly in the next stage of our work, following the interim report, for ways in which we can enhance that participation by the various members of our citizenry. We are quite conscious of that need, not just because it has been expressed to us, but because it is something we began with, very clearly wanting to open up the process as much as possible. The fact that we have had the extensive kinds of hearings that we have had, even with the problems that we have encountered, I hope is an indication of our willingness to try to open up the processes as much as possible.

We have gone slightly beyond the time, but I think people did want to try to get some questions. We will try to get to at least one.

Mr F. Wilson: Your organization has a well-deserved reputation for comprehensive and thought-provoking documents, presentations and papers, much like the one we have heard today, and I thank you for that. There are so many questions I would like to ask, but I am going to have to keep it to one very well-defined one and, on the other hand, so general. I wonder if you could tell this committee and watching Ontario, since you are a national organization, what are you hearing from the women of Quebec and aboriginals—principally Quebec? How do they seem to be valuing Canada and perhaps the process that we are using here?

Ms Macpherson: It is very difficult to find out what the women in Quebec are doing. We did have a very big branch in Quebec up until the mid-1970s, when the preoccupations of women particularly took them into the status-of-women groups, and we lost touch with many of our sisters from there. It seems that the picture is confused. There are many, certainly, who wish to remain with the Canadian picture, but there are a great many who have been stimulated and given a chance to use their own voices and to make their own decisions, so that the opportunity for an independent point of view is certainly there. I cannot tell you the answer, but I do think what we must do and which did come up, I think, previously—this is where Ontario might very well make more contacts and more communications. I think last night one of the teachers was discussing it, but did not follow up on the possibility of exchanges in much greater depth than have taken place in the teaching profession among students, among citizens,

who could learn about each other in the way that we are trying to do here. In fact, if there were a possibility for some opportunities of this kind to take place between Quebec citizens and Ontario citizens it might add to our general knowledge, which we badly need, because we are very poorly informed about the feelings and the aspirations of our Quebec members. Sorry I cannot answer it any better than that.

Ms Adelson: Can I add something?

The Chair: Go ahead, yes.

Ms Adelson: We have always had a strong commitment to the—we were active, French- and English-speaking members of our organization, in the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. I think we share a sense of sorrow in that the Meech Lake accord became something that pitted Canadians against each other, so we found that people, especially women in Quebec, had now divided loyalties. Should they speak for Quebec? Should they speak up as women? And I do not think that these concerns are mutually exclusive; the process made them so. We had no problems with the clauses dealing with Quebec in the Meech Lake accord. We did not think that the package deal had to also eliminate—well, certainly put into question the rights of women, aboriginal people, multicultural groups and all the other concerns with it. That is why we did not support Meech Lake, not because they tried to address the concerns of Quebec, which have to be addressed, quite frankly.

1050

The Chair: Okay, thank you very much. We will end there. Thank you.

ONTARIO WOMEN'S ACTION COALITION

The Chair: Could I invite next representatives from the Ontario Women's Action Coalition?

Dr Cameron: My name is Barbara Cameron and I am here with Janet Maher, who is a member of the co-ordinating committee of the Ontario Women's Action Coalition.

OWAC was founded in 1990 to co-ordinate advocacy of women's groups in Ontario on issues of primarily provincial concern. It is the parallel at the provincial level of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. It counts among members or applicants for membership Union culturelle des Franco-Ontariennes, Ontario Coalition for Better Child Care, Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses, Ontario Coalition for Abortion Clinics, Federation of Women Teachers' Associations of Ontario and a broad range of other organizations.

We would like to begin by thanking the committee for the opportunity to present our views on the Constitution, and we want to emphasize that we see this as the beginning of a process. We think that much more debate and discussion is needed.

We feel that up until last June constitutional debates, particularly in English-speaking Canada, were the property of the political elites, and that a grass-roots discussion is just getting under way. For some time there has been a debate in Quebec and among the first nations, and they have arrived at some conclusions about constitutional

changes that are needed for them. We think one of the challenges facing the committee will be to reconcile two quite different timetables. One is the timetable of the people of Quebec and the first nations, which is an urgent timetable to see a resolution of their long-standing concerns. The other timetable is of the rest of Canada, where a debate on the kind of political arrangements we want to have is just beginning. What we are concerned about is that we do not want decisions made which will preclude a far-reaching, grass-roots discussion in Ontario and the rest of English-speaking Canada.

What we would like to do is divide our brief into, first of all, our view of the way to address the concerns of Quebec and the first nations, and then to talk about the issues that we think are facing the rest of the country. Our views on the concerns of Quebec and first nations comes from the debates that have taken place within the National Action Committee on the Status of Women.

We know that the women of the first nations see as an urgent priority a recognition of the right of native peoples to self-government and the settlement of land claims. For them this is the precondition for any progress on improving the position of women in aboriginal societies, and we want to urge the Ontario government to lend its support to the call of first nations for self-government and for the settlement of land claims. We think this is an urgent priority. These cannot be pushed to the bottom of the constitutional list, which is what was going to happen around the Meech Lake accord.

We know, too, that events in Quebec are moving very quickly. We are aware that la Fédération des femmes du Québec, the very well-established counterpart of our organization in Quebec, in its presentation to the Bélanger-Campeau commission, supported Quebec independence, and we understand that a number of other francophone Quebec women's organizations have supported Quebec independence.

From the debates and dialogue which took place within the National Action Committee on the Status of Women around the Meech Lake accord, we know this position comes from a strong belief that the Quebec government is the best defender of their interests, both as women and as Quebecers. We respect the position of our sisters in Quebec and support their right to choose the form of government which best meets their aspirations. No matter what the outcome of the current constitutional round is in Canada, we are committed to retaining our links of solidarity with the women in Quebec and they have expressed that as well, that they wish to continue no matter what the outcome of the constitutional discussions is.

In debates which took place within the National Action Committee on the Status of Women around the Meech Lake accord, it was clear that the women of Quebec and the women of English Canada had quite different attitudes to the role of their respective provincial governments. The Quebec women tended to see the Quebec government not just as a provincial government but as their national government, and supported the increase of provincial powers implicit in the Meech Lake accord. The women from outside of Quebec, on the other hand, saw the federal government

as the national government and were deeply concerned about the weakening of federal powers over social programs, which was one of the features of the accord.

Through a long and sometimes difficult process of dialogue between representatives of the women of Quebec and of English Canada, an awareness developed that the differences in attitude towards the two levels of government were not superficial but were deeply held, reflected quite different historical and modern-day experiences. In order to accommodate the aspirations of the women of both Quebec and English Canada, the National Action Committee adopted a position endorsing the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society and the five demands of Quebec for greater powers for its government, but rejected the extension of these same powers to the other provincial governments. On this basis, NAC rejected the Meech Lake accord.

I want to emphasize what the representatives of the Voice of Women said, that the position of the women's movement was never a rejection of the part of the Meech Lake accord that dealt with Quebec, that it was always a recognition of Quebec as a distinct society, but it was the decentralization for the rest of the country that was very strongly opposed.

We urge the select committee to recommend to the Ontario government that it support the constitutional recognition of the distinct nature of Quebec and of the extension to the Quebec government of special powers, at the same time that it strongly endorses the maintenance of a strong role for the federal government in social and economic programs for the rest of the country.

I should say on this that I am not completely clear on what the position of the current government is. I know what the tradition historically has been of the NDP on this, but I do not know if there is a moving towards more support for decentralization, which we would strongly oppose. We think it is very dangerous. We also think that it is part of the agenda of business and Conservatives who want to erode social programs, and we would strongly oppose that position.

I would like to move on now—I am sorry I am going so fast, but we do not have much time—to talk about the agenda, which we consider a more long-term agenda, around rethinking the rest of Canada.

The situation in English Canada is quite different than in Quebec and among the first nations. Here there is no consensus around an agenda for constitutional reform. This does not, however, mean that there is not a widespread consensus around the kind of society Canadians would like to see and the kind of values that Canadians share. I think that the presentations both of Salome Loucas from Women Working with Immigrant Women and Kay Macpherson and the other representatives from the Voice of Women confirm this, that there are certain values we share.

Despite six and a half years of concerted effort by the federal Conservative government, Canadians retain a strong commitment to a society in which everyone is guaranteed a minimum level of social security and the resources of government are directed towards ensuring greater social equality. The inability of the Tories and their

supporters among big business to reverse this commitment has forced them to proceed with the dismantling of Canada's welfare programs through the back door. Their strategy to achieve this has included the Canada-US free trade agreement, the partial de-indexation of old-age pensions and family allowances, and cuts in transfer payments to the provinces. I understand that the presentation of the National Action Committee went into this in some detail around unemployment insurance.

A positive vision of the kind of society that Canadians want to see is articulated most clearly and consistently in the demands put forward by women's organizations and other popular organizations in this province. At the centre of this vision of what kind of society we want is the value of equality. A fundamental commitment of the women's movement is a commitment not only to sexual equality but to racial and social equality. Another basic commitment of women's organizations is to the protection of the rights of minorities, whether these be linguistic minorities, people with disabilities, racial or ethnic minorities, and that was stressed in the previous briefs, too.

Connected to these values is the view that the appropriate role of government is to create the conditions which will bring about social, sexual and racial equality, which will allow individuals to realize their full potential as human beings, free from discrimination. The achievement of a society based on these values should be the end of all government policy whether that policy be concerned with industrial strategy taxation, trade or human rights. From this perspective, the question which is just beginning to be addressed is this: Do current constitutional arrangements and political institutions facilitate or obstruct the achievement of the objective of greater social equality?

1100 Looked at from the perspective of grass-roots women's organization, the answer to this question has to be that political institutions hinder rather than help the achievement of the objective of social equality. We just want to run through a couple of examples. One is child care. There is a desperate and growing need for quality accessible child care services in Ontario. There is also widespread public support for the expansion of such services, yet parents and others advocating the expansion of child care services find themselves shunted between the municipal, provincial and federal governments with each claiming the other is to blame for the miserable level of services currently available.

The same is true of welfare. A single mother on welfare who wishes to become involved politically in the fight for a decent standard of living for herself and her family must become an expert on complicated formulas for the sharing of costs between different levels of government.

Under this system, politicians at all levels are able to escape responsibility, as it becomes almost impossible to figure out which level of government to hold accountable. The frustration people experience attempting to bring about change leads to feelings of powerlessness and alienation from political life.

The Constitution itself is an example of the way Canadian political institutions are an obstacle to the achievement

of greater social equality. How many Canadians are aware of the division of powers between the federal and provincial governments? How many understand the way social programs are funded? In the debate around the Meech Lake accord, how many people actually knew what the federal spending power was?

The recent federal budget is an example of the problems with our existing constitutional arrangements. Despite widespread opposition to the decentralization inherent in the Meech Lake accord, the federal Conservatives are winding down federal responsibility for social programs and shifting the financial burden on to the provincial governments. The Conservative government is counting on the lack of public understanding of federal-provincial arrangements to deflect opposition. A frontal attack on social programs would have aroused instant anger; putting a cap on transfer payments accomplishes the same end.

By phasing out direct federal financial responsibility for social programs, the Conservatives are eroding the capacity of the federal government to impose country-wide standards. Finance Minister Wilson's stated intention to bring in legislation enforcing national standards is a cheap propaganda trick designed to mislead Canadians about the government's intentions.

The complexity of Canada's constitutional arrangements contributes to feelings of powerlessness and discourages the participation in political life of women, racial and ethnic minorities, people with disabilities and the poor. For the most part, politics remains the playground for the privileged élites.

Cutbacks in government spending further contribute to the alienation of Canadians from their governments. With each cutback, the quality of service declines as the pressure on the public service workers delivering the service increases. Government becomes less and less accessible to the people who need it most. Immigrant workers attempting to pursue a claim under employment standards, for example, find themselves caught in a maze of bureaucracy. Unemployed workers have to wait for weeks and weeks before they see their first cheque.

Women feel the effects of these cutbacks both as the recipients of government services and as workers in the public sector.

A result of this situation is a deep cynicism about politics and about politicians and an erosion of support for government institutions. This alienation is something right-wing politicians are trying to pick up on and turn into sentiment against government. If government is acting only in the interest of a few, why support government?

The point we wish to emphasize with these examples is that there is a growing frustration with government in Ontario and the rest of the country and that this frustration is related to constitutional arrangements even though it is not usually expressed in those terms.

To a great extent, the growing complexity of federal-provincial relations is related to the inability of governments in Canada to address the concerns of Quebec. A refusal to recognize that the situation of Quebec is different from that of other provinces has been a barrier to a sensible rethinking of the division of powers among governments in Canada. Instead, we have been subjected to

elaborate federal-provincial funding arrangements and endless behind-closed-doors negotiating sessions where provincial politicians promote agendas which often do not enjoy the support of their citizens.

It is our view that once the urgent concerns of Quebec and the first nations are addressed, then attention must be turned in constitutional discussions to a democratization of political institutions in the rest of Canada. The kind of political institutions we wish to create will require widespread public debate.

Based on the discussions which have taken place to date in the women's movement, we would like to make some proposals as a contribution to the debate about the kind of Constitution and political institutions needed.

1. An effective central government capable of ensuring the existence of common standards for social programs and of putting in place economic strategies which will create the conditions for equality and eliminate regional disparity.

2. Measures to improve representation of regions within the government of Ontario and of Canada, including consideration of an electoral system based on proportional representation.

3. Affirmative action measures to ensure greater representation in political institutions of women, visible ethnic and linguistic minorities and people with disabilities. I should say here that the points raised by Salome Loucas from Women Working with Immigrant Women about multiculturalism also need to be part of the discussion and included in a vision of the kind of political arrangements we want in English-speaking Canada.

4. Measures to allow both the users and deliverers of government services input into the design and delivery of those services, reform of bodies such as the advisory council on the status of women to ensure that they are accountable to the constituency they purport to represent and act as advocates for that constituency rather than as a buffer between it and the government.

5. The democratization of the boards of hospitals, post-secondary institutions and of police and other commissions to include representation from all sectors of the community affected, not just business. And we should point out that there is a long-standing demand of the visible minority community in Toronto for greater control of the bodies investigating police, which is something that the Ontario government could act on immediately.

6. The strengthening within the Constitution of the rights of women and of minorities, including francophone, racial and ethnic minorities and people with disabilities, and expansion of constitutionally protected rights to include the right of women to reproductive choice, the right to housing, the right to employment and other social rights.

7. Measures to restore public confidence in the fairness of government, including a reform of the tax system and the restoration of adequate levels of funding for education and health care and the introduction of a system of universal child care as a basic public service.

We would like to point out that one of the obstacles to democratic debate in Ontario and the rest of Canada is a lack of resources that many grass-roots organizations have

to conduct debate about the future of Canada's Constitution and our political institutions. I would just like to reinforce what Kay Macpherson said about the difficulty of having dialogue with women in Quebec, that one positive suggestion out of this select committee could be a fund to which organizations could apply to get resources to invite their counterparts from Quebec and from among the first nations to come and talk to their organizations. Also the idea that Kay Macpherson talked about about exchanges: If you are not a university student, an average working person does not have very much opportunity to go to Quebec or to learn the language by going to Quebec, and that would be a positive contribution the government can make.

The Chair: If I could just interrupt to say that we have gone past the time, if you would sum up.

Dr Cameron: Okay, we have our summary on the last page, which I will not go through. It just sums up the points we have made.

The Chair: All right, thank you very much for your presentation, once again a very comprehensive and very positive outline of some of the things that we need to address. Thank you very much.

Dr Cameron: We do not get any questions?

The Chair: Let me just see. I do not know whether there were. Mr Offer actually did want one question. We will do it very quickly, hopefully.

Mr Offer: In your presentation you have brought forward a theme which I think is very important. It talks about the two different timetables. I think that is crucially important, especially in terms of the role that the province of Ontario should play in this area. I am wondering if you can share with us whether these two timetables should be linked. I am not saying one should be a condition of another—for instance, the negotiations ongoing with Quebec should be conditioned on whether there will be constitutional entrenchment of, let's say, multicultural rights—but whether there is some connection that you see as mandatory.

1110

The reason I ask this is because I have a concern that potentially there is a possibility that the Quebec issues may, of course, be resolved without constitutional amendment, yet all of the presentations which we have heard before this committee on the basis of constitutional change—if not for women then for multicultural groups and first nations—all seem to have not been addressed. I think that you have spoken to this in these two different timetables, but I am wondering if you can share with me whether you have thought about how those timetables can or should be connected.

Dr Cameron: The first point I would like to make or that is that they are connected in the sense that decisions should not be made which cut off a debate in English speaking Canada, and I am thinking about the proposals that are coming forward from academics who are connected to business and from business organizations in favour of decentralization. For some people this seems like a very neat way to address the concerns of Quebec. It is the

formula that was in Meech Lake, that we give all the regions or all the provinces additional powers.

That may seem like a simple solution, but our experience in the women's movement is that in English-speaking Canada that is widely opposed, and that if we have time for a grass-roots discussion we will find out that it is widely opposed. What I am very afraid of right now is that the élites are going to impose that not only because it meets the needs of Quebec, which I think is a secondary concern, but that it fits in with a business agenda of eroding social programs and eroding the federal role in social programs. That is a linkage we do not want made. We do not want them to move with decentralization in English-speaking Canada without finding out whether or not that is what people want.

The other point I want to make is that because our Constitution has become so complicated, it is very difficult for us to address some of what we need to about the kind of institutions we want in English-speaking Canada until the issue around Quebec is settled, because we have to know what Quebec's relationship is to the federal government. My sense is that, if that is settled, English-speaking Canadians are going to want a fairly radical rethinking of the division of powers between the two levels of government. But as long as the centre of those discussions is Quebec's relationship with the federal government, I do not think we can get on with the debate in English-speaking Canada. So, I would worry about putting off addressing the concerns of Quebec. I think that is the priority, and we can get about disentangling the complicated arrangements that have been set up as a way to address Quebec's concerns.

NATIVE CANADIAN RELATIONS RESOURCE CENTRE

The Chair: Could I call next the representatives from the Native Canadian Relations Resource Centre. If you could identify yourselves for the record, I would appreciate that.

Ms D. McGregor: Hi. I am Deborah McGregor from the native Canadian relations theme area at York University.

Ms Metson: I am Marla Metson from the Native Skills Centre in Toronto.

Ms L. McGregor: I am Leslie McGregor, and I am from the Native Skills Centre here in Toronto.

The Chair: Welcome. Carry on, please.

Ms D. McGregor: Okay. The native Canadian relations theme area focuses on the relationship between the native community and its organizations in broader Canadian society. That tends to be our focus, and a review of what we are going to talk about is: Marla will address general concerns, her observations of current aboriginal and Canadian relations in Canada; I will talk about why aboriginal people may not wish to participate in Canadian society; and Leslie will talk about what is required for aboriginal people in Canada to be able to participate effectively.

Ms Metson: First of all, my observations are based primarily on my experience working at the Native Skills Centre. It is based in Toronto and it is an employment program where native people learn computer skills. They have work placements into the business sector and government.

My observation has been, yes, native people do want to participate, they do want to get jobs and participate fully in the benefits the Toronto economy can provide, but there is an alienation with that society. They do not want to become the same as Canadians. There is that alienation there, and I think there is a sense that becoming Canadian means selling out their native culture. I find that very disturbing, that they cannot maintain the identity of being Canadian and being native at the same time, and I think there are a lot of things that have been happening and a lot of historical reasons why that is happening. My colleagues here at the table are going to be addressing those issues.

Ms D. McGregor: It is hard to talk about the nature of relations now without talking about the past, and that is that from day one aboriginal people had always been willing to share and welcome the people who came here. I do not think that should ever change. We are still always going to be that way. It is not us who have to change, it is Canadian society, probably in a reflection in the Constitution.

There were the treaties, and that was two nations making a treaty. I do not know if the Constitution really reflects that now, recognizing first nations as being a separate nation and trying to make an agreement. It is kind of like: "We're doing you a favour. Maybe we'll mention you," so that kind of attitude has to change.

Most government policy in the past was geared towards assimilation, even though it was called, "We'd like you to participate fully and economically in Canadian society." It usually meant you had to change a lot and you had to become a part of something you did not particularly want to. I think that is a lot of what self-government is about. We want to participate, but in our own way, and that has to be reflected in the Constitution. I think it is important to know, and I am very proud of this, that native people have survived for so long despite the oppression and for, I do not know, 500 years or so, we have still managed to survive, and I think it is about time Canada recognized that, hopefully in the Constitution.

I think what is there is inadequate and it is becoming increasingly obvious to everyone, the two little paragraphs—and Meech Lake. My comment on that is that it is very liberal of Canada to recognize Quebec and the French concerns as legitimate, but the same consideration should have been extended to aboriginal people. I think that is a reflection of the attitude and that has to change.

I do not think new legislation can just be created and new parts put into the Constitution without even looking at how to redress the past and the past treaties and those kinds of things. That will always come up. People are going to say: "We don't want you to get rid of them. We don't want our relationship to change." As far as those original at that time, 200 years ago, whenever those agreements were made, we are still a first nation, we are still going to look at you the same way, and can you offer the same kind of consideration.

I just want to stress the point again that aboriginal people have a unique relationship with Canada. It is different from other groups. There are treaties, there are rights and those must be recognized.

What else did I have? Again, just to reiterate the point that it is Canada that has to change its attitude. The current structures in Canada, institutions, do not support aboriginal aspirations at this point, such as self-government. I think Canada has a few things to work out for itself before it can become desirable for us to want to be part of it.

That is what I have to say, other than that the nature of the relationship definitely has to change and it will have to be reflected in the Constitution but in a different way, with a different kind of attitude and approach. Leslie will talk about what is the requirement in order to make Canada rather desirable to be part of.

Ms L. McGregor: I think what is most important and what is most obvious here, as Deb talks about, is the idea of assimilation as opposed to participation. Native people do not want to lose their culture. It is very unique for us, it is very supportive to our own development. For instance, what we do at the Native Skills Centre is try to let people maintain their own identity, maintain their own culture while participating in the work culture, and a lot of it is in non-native organizations in the city. It is a lot of work to do to make people proud of this heritage that so often has been called down. You are looking at employers who have this perception of native people being—again, I am generalizing—lazy, or they see these people out on the street and feel it is a result of the people themselves rather than as a result of something that has been put on them.

1120

I think it is important for native people to maintain their identity and for Canadian society abroad, whether it is new nations coming from other countries, to understand that Canada does have a unique relationship with native people and that they have to respect it, because I do not think the respect is there. I think a lot of it has to come through education. In the history books when we are learning history throughout high school, you are not really learning about native people; you are learning about the French and the English, and what does that say for the native students going through the education system? They are just not learning it. Even for the immigrant people coming into the country, a lot of them do not know about the native people in Canada, and they are just wondering what we are and why we get these special rights when we should be so thankful that we are in Canada altogether. That is basically what I have to say.

The Chair: Maybe I could just ask you to comment a little about what kinds of things you think we can do as a government, particularly in this area of the last point you made about ways in which we can make sure that people in the communities at large are more aware of the special role and the place of native peoples in our society. What kinds of things can we do as a government, beyond rectifying the injustices that have been perpetrated over the years against native peoples? We obviously know that a lot of it would be in addressing those injustices, but just in terms of general public awareness, what more can we be doing?

Ms L. McGregor: First of all, I think different nations have to be comfortable with themselves in order to respect

other nations. Whether it is non-native, Italian, Portuguese—they have to have a respect for their own culture before they can respect other ones.

In terms of what the government can do, I think there needs to be more programs such as ours. We are giving people marketable skills to go back into the workforce, but we are also giving them something that is really important, which is their self-confidence, and I think the self-confidence of the people right now is really low. Just basically more programs like that.

Ms Metson: Also, as Leslie mentioned about the education system, if the curriculum was put into the schools at the public school level, understanding from a very young age what the historical relationship has been with native people, understanding why they had the special rights, I think would do a lot for the native people and for Canadian society to understand better what native people are fighting for.

The Chair: Thanks very much for coming before us.

CONSEIL DES ORGANISMES FRANCOPHONES
DU TORONTO MÉTROPOLITAIN
CENTRE FRANCOPHONE DE TORONTO

The Chair: I call then representatives from le Centre francophone. Si vous voulez bien nous donner vos noms.

M. D'Aigle : Bonjour. Mon nom est Claude-Reno D'Aigle.

Je vous remercie de m'accorder votre attention aujourd'hui. Je suis, comme je viens de le dire, Claude-Reno D'Aigle, président du conseil d'administration du COFTM/Centre francophone à Toronto. COFTM veut dire Conseil des organismes francophones du Toronto métropolitain. À mes côtés est Anne Rich, la directrice générale au Centre francophone.

Le COFTM/Centre francophone regroupe 60 organismes membres et 200 individus membres. Ayant été fondé en 1977, il est le plus ancien et le plus grand regroupement de son genre dans la communauté urbaine de Toronto. Nous desservons une population d'individus parlant le français qui se chiffre aux environs de 350 000.

L'Ontario doit devenir un leader pour la cause du français au Canada, mais pour cela il faut que le gouvernement reconnaisse le caractère unique de la culture française en Ontario et qu'il cesse de la considérer comme une francophonie dépendante du Québec.

Dans l'ensemble du pays, à l'heure actuelle l'attention est portée sur l'avenir du Québec, oubliant que la francophonie existe non seulement au Québec mais à travers tout le pays. Il ne faudrait pas oublier que si le Québec est aujourd'hui ce qu'il est, c'est en partie grâce à deux frontières de forces humaines, c'est-à-dire les francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick, les Acadiens et nous les francophones de l'Ontario. Cet isolement naturel a aidé le Québec à protéger sa culture de l'influence anglophone.

D'une certaine façon, la première ligne de défense de cette culture sont les francophones hors Québec, ces cadavres encore chauds qui, eux, vivent quotidiennement cette dualité entre francophones et anglophones.

Nous ne sommes plus des colonies de la France et de la Grande-Bretagne. Nous formons un pays unique fondé à l'origine par trois peuples distincts : les Amérindiens, les Français et les Anglais. Ceci constitue la fondation sur laquelle il faut construire notre pays. Nous proposons de préserver notre fondation et de réparer les murs de notre patrimoine. Tant que les francophones hors Québec défendent leurs droits, le Québec sera protégé dans ce pays.

Revenons maintenant à notre préoccupation majeure dans l'immédiat, la cause de la langue française en Ontario et plus précisément dans notre capitale, Toronto.

Afin de mieux situer et structurer la réflexion qui va suivre, voici les points spécifiques sur lesquels j'aimerais attirer votre attention.

Il faut que l'Ontario devienne un partenaire d'égale importance en obtenant la considération qu'il mérite concernant le fait français au Canada. Par exemple, ce que je veux dire c'est qu'on participe également avec le Québec, le Nouveau-Brunswick et les gros noyaux francophones au fait français au pays.

Il faut que les francophones hors Québec se prennent en main et qu'ils fassent pression sur le gouvernement fédéral afin qu'il respecte ses obligations à l'égard des minorités francophones.

En Ontario, le gouvernement provincial nous donne son appui dans nos revendications par l'entremise de la Loi 8. Il manque présentement l'appui fédéral qui, par son attitude, laisse supposer que le Québec est la seule province avec une culture française viable. Par exemple, tout récemment dans le domaine des communications, le gouvernement fédéral a décidé que l'Ontario n'avait pas droit à sa propre station de télévision française. On oblige l'Ontario français à se joindre à l'Ouest québécois pour recevoir des services de télévision en français.

Nous avons notre propre station, mais pour remercier les Franco-Ontariens de leurs douze années de travail acharné, on nous a enlevé la station CBLFT Toronto, Ontario. Les francophones de l'Ontario se voient donc en quelque sorte jetés dans la gueule du loup en étant laissés à l'anglicisation et l'influence québécoise. Le danger qui guette cette partie de la francophonie est donc celui de l'assimilation à plus ou moins long terme en raison de l'absence de communication interrégionale.

Il faudra donc que l'Ontario développe un meilleur système de protection de sa minorité francophone pour contrebalancer l'impact des mauvaises décisions de certaines institutions fédérales et pour se protéger des forces antianglophones.

1130

Mme Rich : Nous, Franco-Ontariens, sommes prêts, et depuis longtemps, à prendre en main notre système d'éducation. À ce titre, nous voulons des collègues communautaires et une université à notre image. J'ajouterais aussi des projets de formation pour adultes qui existent déjà par l'entremise du Centre francophone. Nous croyons que l'Ontario devrait, comme le Nouveau-Brunswick, reconnaître les droits de ses citoyens francophones et faire le nécessaire pour que le financement soit disponible.

L'Ontario doit s'efforcer d'éviter toute séparation de ce pays parce que la francophonie s'en trouverait divisée et par conséquent affaiblie à un degré dangereux.

L'Ontario doit défendre l'importance d'être Canadien et promouvoir le fait qu'être Canadien, c'est avant tout de pouvoir accepter notre diversité dans son ensemble et reconnaître à part égale les trois peuples fondateurs.

L'Ontario doit aussi servir de modèle pour la promotion des bienfaits du multiculturalisme.

Enfin, l'Ontario doit être un leader pour répondre à la réalité autochtone, afin de faire reconnaître son importance dans ce pays et assurer une participation réelle de ses véritables peuples fondateurs.

M. D'Aigle : Voilà la volonté francophone des organismes du Toronto métropolitain. Nous répétons encore que le mot «francophone» englobe ici tous les francophones de l'Ontario, indépendamment de leurs origines culturelles ou ethniques.

Étant moi-même originaire de l'Acadie, c'est-à-dire de Edmundston, au Nouveau-Brunswick, je suis à Toronto depuis 22 ans. J'y ai fait grandir ma famille en français et je suis la preuve vivante que tout est possible. Je tiens à vous faire remarquer que j'ai découvert l'importance de ma langue ici en Ontario.

Je vous remercie de nous avoir reçus et j'ose espérer que nos commentaires pourront guider votre commission à formuler le rôle que devra jouer l'Ontario dans la Confédération canadienne.

M. le Président : Merci bien.

CHARLES CACCIA

The Chair: I invite next Charles Caccia, MP for Davenport, to come forward.

M. Caccia : Merci, Monsieur le Président et membres du comité. Je voudrais tout d'abord vous remercier de me donner votre attention cet avant-midi. Je voudrais aussi vous féliciter pour le bon travail que vous avez fait jusqu'à date. Votre tâche n'est pas facile. Je voudrais aussi vous souhaiter un bon travail d'ici le 21 mars, votre date finale pour préparer un rapport qui, j'en suis très sûr, sera un rapport pas facile à écrire mais de grande importance.

The submission is going to be only partial. I will go slowly because simultaneous translators also have rights, and I will only deal with a few points—first with process. As you may have heard already in other sittings, Canadians have on a variety of occasions indicated that they reject the process of deals between politicians. That has been hammered on a number of occasions.

Second, again on process—it deals already with some substance—there seems to be a notion out there that you either have a strong federal government and weak provinces or a weak federal government and strong provinces. I submit to you that you can have a strong federal government and strong provinces in a healthy federation. Today in the Globe and Mail there is an article that again raises the notion of decentralization as strong provinces, weak federal government. I reject that notion as being false.

Third, your report will be read outside Ontario with equal if not greater attention, and not only in Quebec but in

the west, and not only in Quebec and in the west but also north of 60, so your message is of the greatest importance.

It seems to me that at this stage what we want to say out of Ontario is something not within the context of a divorce situation but within the context of a mutually reinforcing situation. That task is not an easy one. You are up to the challenge, I am sure, and I am certain from my limited knowledge of Quebec and the west that they are dying to hear something positive coming out of Ontario that reaches out. In other words, you will be speaking or writing or communicating with your report on a political mandate which is much broader than the province of Ontario. You will be really talking as national politicians. So much for process.

On the substance, a lot is being said these days on the changes in the distribution of powers. I would like to submit a few principles, if I may: that the changes in the distribution of powers, or that any change in such, should guarantee the rights of freedoms of citizens; second, that any change in the distribution of powers should ensure that the two main linguistic communities in this country are not only maintained but also strengthened; third, that any change in the distribution of powers must guarantee respect for and the growth of our aboriginal peoples, as we heard a short while ago; fourth, that any change in the distribution of powers should promote both the rights and the growth of cultural communities—you will be really designing the new Canada perhaps in your report, not the Canada of 1910 but the Canada of the year 2000; fifth, any change in the distribution of powers should endeavour at least to maximize the quality of living and standards of living across the nation; sixth, any change in the distribution of powers should facilitate the working of the Canadian economic union.

Very briefly, a few more points: the entrenchment of aboriginal rights is still an unfinished business since 1982. We heard a few moments ago voices to that effect, perhaps expressed in a different manner. Entrenchment of aboriginal rights is something that we must do.

Official bilingualism until last night I thought ought to be raised here this morning, but the news reports have somehow pre-empted what the Premier of Ontario has said, or is reported as saying in the news. That is a most unfortunate development because Ontario has actually done extremely well over the years, first under Conservative and then under Liberal and now under NDP government, in moving closer and closer to official bilingualism. There is still one step to be taken and it is not an easy one, politically speaking, and you must have heard quite strong polarized views on this subject, judging from newspaper reports. Nevertheless, somehow Canada is waiting for Ontario to make a generous gesture, and I thought until this morning that official bilingualism could have been that kind of gesture.

To conclude, two more items on substance: This province is fortunate to have an outstanding Environment minister. She has spoken on a number of occasions of a bill of rights on the environment. You have an opportunity to translate some of those thoughts into a clause that would

clarify the present Constitution in a manner that environmental rights are embodied in Canada's Constitution.

Finally, Senate reform, which in itself could warrant a set of hearings across the nation and which is the subject of very intense, hot feelings, has to be addressed as part of the unfinished business. My historical recollection since 1982 as to what was said then is that the unfinished business did not relate to the sharing of powers. No, it related to reform of existing Canadian institutions: the Senate, the Supreme Court, you name it. However, there has been a rewriting of history in recent times, and therefore I felt it necessary to make that point. The Senate, the Supreme Court and the entrenchment of aboriginal rights were the main items that had not been given the desirable attention at that time.

1140

Mr Chairman, this ends my presentation because I know you are overworked, tired and have other witnesses to hear. I want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you.

Mr Offer: Mr Caccia, thank you for your presentation. As you know, we have been travelling the province hearing a great many opinions, concerns and hopes. I would like to ask for your reaction to something which has been emerging, and that is in the area of the capping, or in fact the reduction, of federal government transfer payments to the province, resulting in two conclusions. The first is that it in many ways emphasizes decentralization, or in fact will allow the federal government to get out of that particular area of responsibility; or second, putting the legal aspect aside, it morally creates a barrier in a federal government imposing a national standard in an area where it is no longer contributing to its financial capacity. I am wondering if you could share with us your reaction to that proposition.

Mr Caccia: As you realize, Mr Chairman, this is a highly political question.

Mr Offer: It was not meant to be.

Mr Caccia: Being in Ottawa, where we sit, it would be a terrific opportunity to say what I think of the last budget, but I will refrain from such a temptation in saying that whenever you apply different standards in capping with the rich provinces on the one hand and the less well-to-do provinces on the other, you inevitably balkanize the nation. That is in the end the result. We have heard already what the Minister of Health and Social Services for Quebec has said about medicare. Therefore, Mr Offer is quite right to raise it within the context of a constitutional debate.

But having said that, I am a strong believer—rightly or wrongly—that economic issues are not capable of being solved simply by constitutional reform. Mr Wilson has announced his budget within the powers given to the federal government at the present time. It is a policy decision that is rooted in fiscal philosophy, so to say. It can be achieved under the present system. Do we want in the Constitution of the future a phrase that will say that capping cannot be imposed—probably that is the bottom question—in order to ensure that national standards, be they in health or environment or you name it, are secured?

It may be that that is something we should look at. I had not thought of that before.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much. We will have to end at that point.

DISABLED WOMEN'S NETWORK

The Chair: Could I invite next representatives from the DisAbleD Women's Network?

Ms Stimpson: My name is Liz Stimpson. I am chairperson of the DisAbleD Women's Network, Toronto. Because I am blind, I cannot read the brief. My friend, Margaret Best, will read it. She was the person who helped me write it and she was the person who put this together. Because of her, we are here.

Ms Best: I will start with the introduction. This brief to the select committee on Ontario in Confederation is presented by the DisAbleD Women's Network, Toronto. We are the voice of disabled women in Metro Toronto. This brief will address itself to most of the issues in the document known as *Changing for the Better: An Invitation to Talk About a New Canada*.

In this document, Premier Rae has asked us to look around at our neighbours, at our communities, and then to think about what we share as Ontarians and as Canadians.

Unfortunately, it is not that easy. As I look around at my neighbours, or in my case come to meet my neighbours, I realize there is work to be done, inequalities to overcome, balances to be redressed, before I can begin to think, let alone expect my neighbours to think, just what it is we share as Ontarians and Canadians.

You see, my neighbours are black, they are aboriginal, they are disabled, they are lesbians; in fact, most of them are women. They may be Ontarians and they may be Canadians but they cannot yet afford to celebrate those facts, let alone their differences, until the obstacles of discrimination and inequity are first removed.

Ontario is a diverse province; Canada a diverse country. If we want to rediscover consensus, if we want Canadians to be unified and passionate in their support of a strong Canada, we must give all our people an equal footing, the same platform from which to address the issues facing Canada and Confederation. Taking care of our people—all of them—is essential to taking care of Canada.

Realistically, you cannot expect a passionate shout for a unified Canada from people who are trying to overcome more basic, rudimentary obstacles. Unfortunately, if you are a woman, black, Asian, aboriginal or disabled, you are faced with some more immediate, bleak and daily obstacles of discrimination before you can honestly afford the luxury of sharing a vision of Canada. We are talking about trust, about dignity, about treating each other as equals.

My concern is primarily for disabled women. To some, this may seem a limited parameter. But believe me, as disabled women, we are your mothers, your sisters, your daughters, your partners. Anyone can become disabled. It affects us regardless of income, race or creed. Approximately 500,000 Ontarians are disabled. One in six Canadians is disabled.

Therefore, in trying to envision a new Canada, we believe we must first lay the foundations of trust and dignity

for all the peoples of Canada. We can start this process by taking a look at this very committee.

Once again, women have been shafted. Rather than having a woman as the chairperson or, dare we imagine at the very least, women making up half of the members of this committee, we are again underrepresented. When we say this, it is not meant to detract from women like Ms Churley—who I think has left the room temporarily—whose fighting spirit and high intelligence is well known throughout this city. To the best of our knowledge, there are no aboriginal people sitting here on this committee, nor are there any people of colour. We can only assume that aboriginal people, people of colour and women are not a serious part of this province's plan for Canada in the future although we make up most of the population. There really is no excuse for this.

May we remind this committee that this is the second time around for the women of this province to be summoned to appear and speak about the Constitution and Canada, and during the first round we were not listened to? We want to ask this committee: Do you really want to hear what the women of this province have to say on the future of this country?

We would now like to try to address a few of the discussion topics which have been listed in the Ontario government's document known as *Changing for the Better*. I believe that the first topic for discussion—What are the values we share as Canadians?—has been dealt with already in our introductory comments.

1150

1. What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? In any Constitution, the Charter of Rights must take precedence over any other document or clause because the Charter of Rights is the only protection which physically and mentally disabled persons have in this country. We might add, for this committee's interest, that Canada is the only country in the world which has such a provision in its Charter of Rights, and we think it makes a difference. But what good is this wonderful Charter of Rights with clauses 15 and 28 if there is no guarantee that it will be applied and upheld equally from Newfoundland to British Columbia?

We do not agree with all the powers resting with the provinces, leaving a federal government stripped of most of its powers. We would hope that the patriarchy is not once again controlling the lives of women with disabilities, our aboriginal sisters and our sisters of colour.

When the Meech Lake accord was presented in this Legislature, only a handful of members voted against it. The now Premier of this province voted in favour of the Meech Lake accord. The premiers of this country have invariably treated women's equality in a most capricious manner, starting with the Women's Franchise Act of 1918 up to November 1981 and on until June 1990. Women constitutional experts advised us at that time that the Charter of Rights was in jeopardy if the Meech Lake accord should pass.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin has said—and I will faithfully leave it up to each of you to substitute his use of the word "man" with a term more all-encompassing—"The

social aspirations of man cannot attain full originality and full value, except in a society which respects man's personal integrity." Is the Ontario government prepared to sell off democracy and women's equality rights at any cost? Do we have any guarantee that an NDP government will listen to our concerns and support us in protecting the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms this time?

Our worst fears were realized after the Supreme Court decision making the abortion law illegal. Three provinces across the country, arrogating health care to themselves, denied women equal access to health care. It is this precise contempt for the law that makes these kinds of powers in the hands of individual provinces a horror show for women.

For disabled women, this horror which threatens us could be a total disaster. Many of us are on medication which we get through welfare, and some of us must use a family physician plus specialists as well as well as having hospital care. Could we trust any party in provincial power to respect the initiatives of the federal government and/or obey the rulings of the Supreme Court of Canada, should it come to that? It is a neat myth to think that the federal government would have either the will or the capacity in bureaucrats to monitor the health care, welfare, day care or any other such programs in every province.

Disabled women depend on the health care system to also provide them with assistive devices such as wheelchairs and crutches and medical equipment such as compressors for asthma, etc. What guarantee do we have that we will still be receiving these services unless the provincial government listens to us and takes a strong stand in any provincial-federal negotiations?

All things such as health care, day care, welfare and education impact on the lives of disabled women, and nowhere are we given any assurances that we will still be getting these. The Premier of this province has promised us that social services will not be cut, but disabled women will remain uneasy until this becomes a fact, enshrined and secure. Put our trust in the premiers? They have always sold us out.

We believe in a strong federal government and provinces and territories which share powers equally. We also believe in a federal government which should be accountable for its responsibilities to the provinces, ie, transfer payments. This is one of the cornerstones of the Constitution. As we have all no doubt seen by now in the recent 26 February 1991 budget announcement, the transfer payments have yet again been cut, in areas of health and welfare in particular. Add to this the inherited situation of our present Ontario government, which was left with a large deficit and two cuts in transfer payments over the past year, and we are faced with cuts to the safety nets for the poor, unemployed, disabled and elderly. What good are safety nets full of holes? If anything, they are a hazard to safety and health. There is no doubt in my mind as to the sinister and deliberate move on the part of the Tory government in Ottawa to gradually cut off all transfer payments and to put in place a program whereby each province will be left to set up its own health and welfare programs. This obviously will cause an inequity between the

poorest provinces, such as Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, and the better-off, such as Quebec and Ontario.

Canada has prided itself on its social programs. However, when each province is left to its own programs we may end up with a country which has negligible programs in many of the provinces. In my original submission of 1988 one of my deepest fears was that the federal government would be divested of its powers, being left primarily to dole out the moneys and orchestrate a tenuous foreign policy. As is becoming clear, the federal government is no longer doling out any moneys and we have seen just how tenuous our foreign policy has become.

2. How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? We will never achieve justice for aboriginal peoples as long as they are excluded from and/or not taken seriously in provincial and federal decision-making processes. As we have noted already, it angers us that there are no aboriginal people sitting on this committee today, as would be appropriate. Aboriginal people are promised equal rights under the Canadian Charter of Rights and, although the present Tory government is making a mockery of these rights, it is also the responsibility of the provincial government of Ontario to step in and assist aboriginal people who live in Ontario. We are very afraid that if the aboriginal people do not receive a guarantee of their rights from Ontario they will never receive it from the present federal Tory government.

Justice for aboriginal people would include, among the highest priorities, adequate education at the secondary school level in a non-racist atmosphere. The power in our society lies in the now white, male-dominated professions such as law, medicine and corporate business. Aboriginal people must have access to these same avenues of power in order to utilize, humanize and sensitize them. Our aboriginal sisters need good secondary education so that they can enter university with a fair amount of knowledge and ease. It goes without saying that foremost on the agenda of aboriginal people is their right to their lands. Justice for aboriginal people would obviously lie first in a consultation process through which they tell us where their priorities lie and how they want to go about achieving these priorities.

3. What is Quebec's future in Canada? I do not think am the right person to talk about Quebec. However, disabled women do not appreciate the trauma which this country has gone through over one province while other issues have been shelved, neglected and written off. As I have already mentioned, one in six people in this country is disabled. There are approximately 500,000 disabled people in the province of Ontario. We can assume that over half of these people are women. What would happen, I wonder, if disabled women held up the Canadian government for almost five years? Based on experience, we can only surmise that they would not fight to keep us, and, if we threatened to leave, they would hold open the door. We can be fairly certain that they would not be falling over each other in the mad rush to meet our demands. We make these comments only to illustrate the disproportionate amount of time which has gone into altering the Constitution to the detriment of Canada's marginalized people, ie, women, the

disabled, aboriginals, people of colour, the multicultural community, the aging, and lesbians.

4. What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region? During the constitutional crisis of 1990 many of us expected leadership to come from the traditional provinces of power. Is it not odd that the true leadership during that crisis came from such marginalized regions and people as Newfoundland and Elijah Harper, an aboriginal person?

1200

As a result, nothing could be more patently obvious than that we need the Atlantic provinces, we need our Atlantic people, we need the west, we need the whole breadth of vision upon which Canada and its institutions, or more accurately what is left of them, have been built. And, of course, we need women. As Canada becomes dismantled piece by piece, it will be left to women to ensure that we do not come apart at the seams: old women, young women, French and English women, women from our multicultural communities, disabled women, aboriginal women, lesbians, women of colour, all women and from every region of this country.

We need women because our vision remains uncompromised and we have spent 100 years fighting against overwhelming odds to finally arrive today with equality rights, which are an essential building block in the rebuilding of our country. We will not stand by and see all this undone. I think Liz has a final word to say.

Ms Stimpson: I received this document on 8 February. I was given my time and my date on the 26th of bloody February. That left me with almost three days to get this bloody brief together. This is a disgrace, a total disgrace. I am so angry I could scream, but I will not scream.

What the hell is going on here? I am a disabled woman. I do not have the resources to get a brief together, to get my thoughts together, to write it, dictate it, have it typed and rush off to have it copied. What is going on here with this place? We voted for you people. We love you people. We thought you were with us. You promised that you would respect and respond to the grass roots in your communities. But you are not; you are kicking us in the face.

You did not listen to us the last time and as far as I can see you are not listening to us this time. But we will not take it, because we will be back to keep you in line. Now listen, we love you people and, as I said, we voted for you. We want to be with you people, but if you do not care about us, then what the hell can we do about this? I do not expect ever to have this happen to me again. This is the second time this has happened to me in a week.

The Chair: Let me just say, madam, that we understand your feelings on that and we are trying very hard to do our best to improve the process as we go along. This has been, even with all of its flaws, the most extensive discussion process and consultation process that any committee of the Legislature has ever undertaken on any issue, and we have been the first to say that this is only the beginning of the discussion. We know that there have been problems in the process along the way. We are trying to address those problems and trying to do our best.

Quite frankly, we were not necessarily looking for polished, long presentations. We were looking to give the people of the province an opportunity to talk to us about their feelings, about their aspirations for the future of the country and the province, and I think we have gotten that, quite clearly, even though people have not had as much time as they would have liked to prepare their presentations.

As long as we remain committed to that ideal of continuing the discussion and ensuring that all of us, women and men also, understand the needs of the various constituencies—and I think we should not assume, for example, as I think you have done earlier on, that only women can properly necessarily address all of the issues that face women. Obviously, women understand those issues in a much different and better way than men ever can, but it is necessary for men to understand those issues as well, I think, if we are going to come to any conclusions and any useful resolutions of all those. So we accept the criticism and we are doing our best to try to improve the process as we go along.

Ms Stimpson: I would just like to mention one thing. This document is a provincial document, is it not?

The Chair: Yes, it is.

Ms Stimpson: Fine, then I did not get this in the alternate print and that is my right. This is the law of this province. I had to ask the consultant several times. He was in touch with me; he was the only contact I had. I phoned the clerk's office; Margaret phoned the clerk's office. We only got rudeness. Now listen, I should have had this on tape before the middle of this month. Now that is another thing.

The Chair: Again, we realize that those are some of the problems you have identified correctly. Some of those were not within the purview of this committee to monitor and decide upon, but I realize that in terms of the public that does not make any difference. There are some problems that we have identified, as I said, along the way, and we will try to do our best to make sure that they are not repeated. Thanks very much for your presentation.

METRO TENANTS LEGAL SERVICES

The Chair: Could I call next Metro Tenants Legal Services?

Ms Robinson: Hi, my name is Leslie Robinson. I am with Metro Tenants Legal Services. Before I begin the presentation I have prepared for this committee, I want to say that I have been quite moved by the presentation that came before me by the DisAbled Women's Network. I am quite honoured that I had the opportunity to hear their presentation before mine and I personally support both the substance of the presentation that was made and the frustration with the timing and scheduling of these committee hearings.

Metro Tenants Legal Services represents and advocates for low-income tenants in Metropolitan Toronto. From that perspective, we are also involved in a number of coalition groups that advocate for housing rights and generally for social and economic rights in Ontario, in Canada and internationally.

We also received the Changing for the Better paper and saw that the terms of reference for this select committee are to review and report on the social and economic interests and aspirations of all the people of Ontario within Confederation, and what form of Confederation can most effectively meet the social and economic aspirations of the people of Ontario. So those are the terms that I have attempted to address in my submission.

However, when speaking with low-income tenants in Ontario, their experience is that the Constitution of Canada has very little impact on their day-to-day lives. Most low-income people in Canada are more concerned with obtaining adequate housing, food and clothing than with the relationships among the provinces and with the federal government.

We are here today to address the concerns communicated to us by our clients, specifically to address housing rights. We believe that housing rights are relevant to Canada's Constitution, to the province's role in Confederation and to Canadians who are not adequately housed.

The CMHC reported in its November 1990 housing market report that 1.26 million households in Canada were in core housing need in 1988, and core housing need is defined as being in one of three situations: either living in substandard housing that is in need of severe repair or without plumbing facilities; living in housing that is overcrowded, more than three or four people per bedroom; or living in housing for which a household is paying more than 30% of household income for housing costs.

I would also point out that the same CMHC report indicated that senior-led households were twice as likely to be in core housing need as non-senior-led households, that renters were over four times more likely than owners to be in core housing need, and that single parents were about six times more likely than two-parent families and were the most likely of all households to be in need. One out of every three single-parent families in Canada is in core housing need as defined by the CMHC.

It is our position that Canada's Constitution could and should address the needs of our constituency. While the Constitution does give residents in Canada the right to security of the person, it does not specify what that right entails. But we ask the question: How can a person have security if that person is homeless or hungry?

Canada and all the provinces and territories have agreed that all who live in Canada have the right to housing. We have made that agreement through Canada's signature to the United Nations International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and all the provinces and territories agreed before Canada signed that covenant. Through the covenant, Canada has agreed with the 90 other countries that also ratified the covenant that everyone in Canada has the right to an adequate standard of living for him or herself and his or her family, including adequate food, clothing and housing and to the continuous improvement of living conditions. But while it has agreed with these 90 other countries that Canadians have the right to housing, Canada has not made the same commitment to the people of Canada.

1210

Amending the Constitution to specifically guarantee the right to adequate food, clothing and housing would be a good first step towards implementation of this international covenant, and I want to note that last May, in Ottawa, an international conference was held on housing rights, and the participants came from around the world mostly from Canada, also from a lot of Third World countries. The overwhelming consensus at that conference was that we all had to go back to our own countries and push for the inclusion of the right to housing in our charters and in our constitutions, so that is what I am doing here before you today.

Metro Tenants Legal Services shares a concern with other housing advocacy groups across the country that the federal government has been stepping away from its responsibilities to fund housing. Since 1938, when the government of Canada passed the National Housing Act, the federal government has undertaken to provide funding support for the provision of housing, to address housing need in Canada. In the past decade, however, federal contributions to housing spending have been reduced and programs for non-profit housing and the rehabilitation of rental housing have been cut. Not just cut back, but cut out. More and more, the responsibility to fund housing programs has been shifting to the provinces.

I do not know how many people know this, but in Ontario the very first non-profit housing program that was fully funded by the province was introduced in 1986 and was called Project 3000, to build 3,000 units. The next year, in 1987, Homes Now was introduced by the province and was also fully funded by the provincial budget. Provincially funded housing programs in Ontario appear to be the new norm. However, residents in many other provinces in this country are not so fortunate. Most provinces have not responded to federal cutbacks with provincially funded programs, either because funding is not available or because the political commitment does not exist.

Inclusion of the right to housing in Canada's Constitution could give back to the federal government the responsibility to ensure that non-profit housing supply programs are adequately funded and that the 1.26 million households in Canada who are in core housing need have their needs addressed.

We have this morning some specific recommendations for Ontario to ensure that the right to security of the person, as set out in our Constitution, ensures the right to housing, and we want to recommend four things.

The first is that Ontario initiate the amendment of the Constitution to include specifically the right to housing. The second is that Ontario initiate pressure from all of the provinces and territories on the federal government to reduce the number of households in core housing need in Canada by adequately funding non-profit housing programs. The third is to fulfil the province of Ontario's commitment to the right to housing and to reduce the number of households in core housing need that live in Ontario by providing adequate funding for non-profit housing programs, starting with the 1991 Ontario budget. The fourth is to fulfil the province of Ontario's commitment to the right to

housing and to reduce the number of households in core housing need in Ontario by immediately enacting Bill 4, which would amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act to protect tenants against excessively large rent increases.

We sincerely hope that this committee will focus on the real and daily needs of Canadians, which can be met by amending the Constitution to include rights such as the right to housing. We believe that by understanding and addressing the pressing needs of the people of Canada, the governments of Canada, the provinces and the territories will be better focused to address the relationships between those governments. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation.

TORONTO ABORIGINAL
AND METIS ASSOCIATION

The Chair: Could I invite next our final speakers for this morning's session, the Toronto Aboriginal and Metis Association.

Mr Yake: Mr Chairman, committee members, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Indian and Metis people of the Toronto area, I am pleased to welcome you to our homeland, which you call Ontario. Our nations have always lived here and we have always welcomed settlers and visitors to our land. Unfortunately, settlers have not always been so good to us. That is the problem I want to speak to you about today.

Let me begin by telling you a little about aboriginal people. Most Ontarians, even most Ontario MPPs, probably think of reserves when they think of aboriginal people, and they probably think of band councils and the Indian Act when they think of aboriginal political organizations and aboriginal governments. Let me give you a few facts about aboriginal peoples. There are over 250,000 aboriginal people in Ontario. Aboriginal people are defined in the Canadian Constitution as the Indian, Inuit and Metis people of Canada. Of Ontario's 250,000 Indian and Metis people, only about 50,000 are registered status Indians living on reserves. Only these 50,000 are allowed to vote or run for office in band council elections. The rest of us, the 200,000 Indian and Metis people who live off reserves, are prohibited by the Indian Act from participating in band council elections in any way. They cannot vote or run in band council elections. This means that the band councils, which are registered under the Indian Act, represent only about 20% of Ontario's aboriginal people. The rest of us, the 200,000 off-reserve people, have our own political representatives. Unfortunately, both the governments of Canada and Ontario continually and totally ignore us.

A brief history lesson is necessary for you to understand how the situation came to be. When settlers from Europe first arrived in the land that you now call Ontario, they found it occupied by powerful, self-governing nations, the Iroquois, the Algonquin, the Ojibway and the Cree. Each nation had its own territory, its own laws and governments and its own culture and values.

As settlers and fur traders came to Ontario, many married Indian wives. Thus, by the mid-1700s, distinct self-governing Metis communities existed throughout Ontario. Our nations welcomed settlers. We merely asked, as any

host nation would, that you respect our laws and customs. For a while you did respect our laws and customs, but as more settlers came, you decided that you needed your own government and your own land. We understood this desire and we offered to share our land with you. We therefore made treaties in which each sovereign nation agreed to respect each other's autonomy.

As settlers came to think of themselves as a nation instead of simply as English and French colonists, they eventually sought independence from England. In 1867, England gave Canada its independence, and the Canadian nation, which had developed over only a few generations, became independent. We did not object.

When Canada became independent and self-governing in 1867, it inherited the obligations of the Crown under treaties made with our nations. Unfortunately, Canada almost immediately started breaking its treaties. In 1876, the first Indian Act appeared—that is only nine years—and all subsequent versions of it were intended to destroy our governments and our cultures. The Indian Act therefore classified aboriginal people as either status or non-status. Those who were registered as status Indians could live on reserves. Those who were not registered could not. Families and communities were ruthlessly split, all so that we could be assimilated into your superior European society.

When treaties were signed, we had kept some land to ourselves. These lands, called reserves, have shrunk over the years as a result of land grabs by big business and their allies in Ottawa and the provincial capitals. As reserves shrunk they became poorer and poorer. Many Indian and Metis people were therefore forced to leave reserves to find employment. After they had been away a few years, they found themselves removed from the list of status Indians. These people whose parents and grandparents had signed treaties on their behalf now had their treaty rights ignored and trampled on, merely because they were not registered as status Indians under the Indian Act.

1220

Many other Indian people left reserves to attend residential schools, which were also intended to assimilate us. As more and more aboriginal people left reserves out of economic necessity or because they were now stripped of status under the Indian Act, some did assimilate into white society. Many, however, did not give up their rights or their culture when they left reserves. Instead, they became part of many Metis communities which had developed throughout Ontario since the early 1700s. Today, therefore, there are about 200,000 Indian and Metis people living off reserve in Ontario. Some of us are now status Indians because the Indian Act was amended in 1985 to allow some non-status Indians to become registered.

Of the 200,000 off-reserve native people, about 40,000 are status Indians. They are not represented by the registered band councils, however, because they are not allowed to participate in band council politics, and because they have their own communities and their own political organizations. Not all people with Indian blood are aboriginal. When we say there are 160,000 Metis and non-status Indians in Ontario, we mean only those people who have Indian

blood, self-identify as native, Indian or Metis, and are considered by a native community to be native.

We are represented at the community level by local associations called locals and at the provincial level by the Ontario Metis and Aboriginal Association, called OMAA, the umbrella organization of locals. Both Canada and Ontario ignore OMAA, however. For no reason, both governments behave as if only band councils represent aboriginal peoples. Neither government will negotiate land claims with our people. Why? Neither government will recognize our right to decide how our children are cared for and educated. Why? I could go on, but the point is that we are ignored and have never been told why we are ignored.

The most frustrating thing about this is that we are only asking the federal and provincial governments to obey their own laws. Section 35 of the Canadian Constitution recognizes and entrenches the aboriginal and treaty rights of all aboriginal peoples. The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that section 35 should be read broadly, yet both governments still refuse all of OMAA's offers to negotiate, to identify our rights and to implement laws which respect our rights. Why? We are not asking for a new constitutional arrangement; we are just asking you to respect the Constitution as it now is.

The new government has made many speeches and promises to us in this regard. All I ask is that you keep your promises and respect our loss. OMAA has made many proposals to Ontario for establishing a forum for negotiating on the identification of the constitutional rights of off-reserve aboriginal peoples and the implementation of new institutions, programs and services which respect those rights. Is it not high time that Ontario accepted OMAA's offers to negotiate?

In the Ontario region there are 23 locals. There are four locals in the Metro area and there are 33 native organizations in Toronto that are service organizations, of which we are one. The Toronto Aboriginal and Metis Association is a community-based organization which tries to provide a referral service to programs and services for native people while keeping a native perspective. We see growth in other areas and are looking for the right challenge.

I would like to name the other groups. They are the Humber Valley Metis and Aboriginal Association, the Metro Metis, York Metis and ourselves. I would also like to mention to the Chair that it has been suggested that the best process for the government to deal with groups in the area would be with democratically elected organizations with a paid membership, or with a formal claims commission with a steering committee.

I guess there is one last thing I would like to add here, because the government is not talking to our main body and the only representative it appears to be talking to are the Chiefs of Ontario; at present they do not represent Metis or non-status people, so I think some effort should be made for the government to deal with us.

Also, funding is a must. Core funding for OMAA as the umbrella organization for Ontario should be a priority for the provincial government, using some sort of fast-track process. Thank you, Mr Chairman, thank you, committee members.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. That concludes our session for this morning. We will recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The committee recessed at 1227.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee, in part, resumed at 1414 in room 151.

The Chair: Welcome back. We are back in session, and we should point out again for people who are here in the audience and people who will be following these proceedings over the parliamentary network that we have today, in our last day of hearings of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, divided the committee into two halves in order to try to complete the deputants who want to speak to us. The coverage that is going out over the parliamentary network now will be in sections, alternating every hour, roughly, between the two halves of the committee, but also all of the sessions are being taped and will be replayed in complete sequence on Monday and Tuesday of this coming week.

Ms Churley: I cannot wait.

The Chair: So for any of the ones that people out there missed, they can get the whole gamut.

ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE
EMPLOYEES UNION

The Chair: We want to start this afternoon with the Ontario Public Service Employees Union and to remind speakers again of the 15-minute time limit we have had to place in order to get through, again, as many organizations and people as we can.

Mr Bilideau: My name is Paul Bilideau. I am the communications officer for the Ontario Public Service Employees Union and I am here today on behalf of the 105,000 members of our union across Ontario. The president of our union, Fred Upshaw, would have liked to have been here but he had two prior commitments today and he just could not break away. There was some confusion as to when he would be appearing before the committee, so we are sorry he could not be here, but I will present in his stead our brief, which is I think in your hands, entitled *The Wolf at the Door: How Federal Cuts Endanger Canada*.

It is the position of the union that public service programs form an essential part of the Canadian fabric and indeed the Ontario experience, and it is our position that the current federal government is the main threat to a united Canada, and until the main threat is eliminated, so to speak, we are not going to get anywhere with any kind of constitutional reorganization or a preservation of what we consider is essential in Canada. We believe that in many ways our public service programs and institutions define what Canada is and what Canada could be.

I am not going to read you the entire brief today. I am going to be quite brief, but I will underscore the bottom line again. It is our submission that the biggest threat to Canada is the imminent destruction of our public service system and the biggest destroyer of the system is the current federal government. We contend that the federal government is the main obstacle to the preservation of Canada, and our brief documents the many ways those in power in Ottawa have systematically destroyed the foundation of Canada's public institutions and its social programs. In the name of cutbacks and privatization,

Mulroney's government has sold out Canada to the private interests. Many of them are not part of this country. As the title of our brief indicates, the Mulroney government is the wolf at Canada's door.

We believe that the main threat to Canada's future is not the prospect of a separate Quebec, however onerous that may prove to be. Whatever our brothers and sisters in Quebec decide, we in Ontario and the rest of Canada still have to deal with the main threat. The wolf is at the door. Indeed, the wolf has entered the kitchen and has begun to greedily devour the spoils, the fundamental foundations of Canada, the social programs.

Mulroney and his neoconservative henchmen do not share our vision of Canada. They do not understand the need for universal health and social programs and they seek to destroy them. We contend that public sector programs and institutions can provide Canadians with concrete examples of how the country works, but in the Mulroney years Canada has moved backwards into disaster.

About 3.5 million people in Canada now live in poverty. Poorer citizens are paying more than 75% of their income on shelter alone in the Toronto area. In Toronto 100,000 people a month line up at food banks.

Over the past three years Canadians have witnessed destructive events caused by Ottawa: the free trade agreement with the United States, the crisis at Oka, the failure of the Meech Lake accord. All these were caused, in our opinion, by the current federal government, and now the government wants to go another step further, free trade with Mexico.

We believe that these events are symptoms of the disease that is destroying Canada: a relentless attack by politicians and a neoconservative ideology that is foreign to this country to destroy our fundamental health, social services, education, housing programs, native rights and public corporations.

Mulroney's Bill C-69 is the best example of that. It placed a cap on the Canada assistance plan that transferred payments to the provinces. This week's budget is further proof that the Tories are out to destroy our ability to deliver public programs provincially and municipally.

Public programs are an intrinsic part of our national identity. The government undermines Canada's national identity every time it reduces funding. The government is eliminating programs that bind the country together. If we do not have a federal government, we might as well have 10 countries. A country must represent more than just a flag, a national anthem or a capital city. Citizens must be able to clearly see the value of citizenship and be able to readily identify with the source of the benefits. Programs funded and delivered by government represent the physical evidence of the value of citizenship. The ability to identify the source of public benefits strengthens the bond between the citizen and his country.

1420

The private sector does not give Canada its identity. Multinational corporations are just that; they do not care what country they operate in so long as the wages are low.

They do not foster national identity. In many ways, they work against it. Mulroney is the proof of that. Mulroney, backed by a small group of people who pay only 8.6% of the federal budget, is listening to them 99.9% of the time. Our Canadian identity is reflected in our national institutions and programs. He is getting rid of them.

If we are to preserve our country, we must stop the rape of our social programs and our public institutions. People ask us: "How are we going to pay for that? People already pay too much tax in Canada." We agree that people pay too much tax, but corporations do not. Canada has one of the lowest corporate tax rates in the industrial world.

We think that the decline of Canada is best characterized by Mulroney's tax policy. His so-called tax reform placed a greater burden on working people, the members of our union, while rich people and corporations pay less than their fair share, and sometimes nothing at all. According to this week's budget, as I have said, corporations pay only 8.6% of federal taxes, individuals pay most of the rest. In 1984, when Mulroney was first elected, individuals were paying about \$3 in income tax for every dollar paid by corporations. Now individuals pay \$5 for every dollar paid by corporations. The result is that funding for essential public services falls mainly on the overly taxed low- and middle-income Canadians. This erodes broad public support to pay for public services, the very programs that keep this country together.

No matter what happens in Quebec, Canadians need a government that respects Canada. We need a new economic strategy provincially and federally. Full employment must be the cornerstone of the strategy. The creation of good, secure, well-paying jobs, combined with training, will assure productive use of the workforce.

Through public programs and institutions, the majority of Canadians have enjoyed an improved standard of living. We need new programs to end discrimination in work and pay for women, for immigrants, for visible minorities and for disabled people, and we need to protect our existing services and programs. Only when you do that will Canada regain its appeal for all its citizens. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Thank you.

DAILY BREAD FOOD BANK
ONTARIO COALITION AGAINST POVERTY
CHILD POVERTY ACTION GROUP
BREAD NOT CIRCUSES COALITION

The Chair: We have next a joint presentation by four different organizations which have come together, and we have extended the time for that to half an hour. They are the Daily Bread Food Bank, the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, Child Poverty Action Group and Bread Not Circuses Coalition, if they would come forward now. You can just pull up a couple of additional chairs, if we need them, from the side here.

Mr Sweeney: My name is Derek Sweeney and I am here today to read a statement that was prepared by the Bread Not Circuses Coalition, the Daily Bread Food Bank,

the Child Poverty Action Group and the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty.

The four people who will present testimony over the next 30 minutes represent four different antipoverty advocacy groups. All four are separate and have separate perspectives on poverty issues. Children, housing, hunger and the rights of the poor are interrelated issues, but each is also distinct in many ways.

For that reason, we must open this testimony with a protest. We were lumped together to present a joint testimony in what felt to us like an arbitrary manner. Even realizing the time constraints under which we know you are operating, we still believe that, given their complexity, issues of poverty and inequality deserve a more complete hearing. But it feels as if someone said: "Well, these are just the poverty people. We'll put them all together because they are all the same."

Make no mistake, we do have common concerns and we work together on many of these concerns. For instance, we are all concerned that economic and social rights be included in the Constitution. We are also different and want to be seen as distinct. The wellbeing of hundreds of thousands of low-income people across this province, indeed across Canada, deserves something better.

Mr Shapcott: That having been said, my name is Michael Shapcott. With me is Jan Borowy. We are with the Bread Not Circuses Coalition. We have a written presentation, which I understand will be circulated to you. The bulk of our presentation is a series of documents from the European Community to which I will be making some reference.

We wanted in particular to highlight three issues for the committee as you are considering Confederation.

First of all, we wanted to begin with a political concern. We are concerned that issues around the Constitution tend to come up and politicians tend to wrap themselves in the flag at times of economic stress, at times when there are social crises, and they are often used as a way to divert public attention from social issues and social crises. We saw just recently the rather regrettable spectacle of our Prime Minister coming to Toronto and wrapping himself in the flag and saying that he would not preside over the dismantling of this country, only a couple of weeks later to see his Finance minister proceed to dismantle this country and in particular to dismantle social programs, unemployment insurance and so on. We think this kind of double dealing by politicians is regrettable and that the Constitution is often used by politicians as a way to divert public attention.

We think in fact the constitutional question has to be put on its head—back from its head to its feet—and that the constitutional process should be geared not to meet the political interests and needs of politicians but the real needs of people and look at the real crises in people's lives.

Therefore, and this is my second point, we believe that any Constitution for Canada, any Charter of Rights for Canada, has to include a social and economic dimension. We think it is quite appropriate that our charter includes rights that affect people in the criminal system and we think it is appropriate that our charter has rights around

freedom of expression and so on, but it ignores the biggest reality of most people's lives, and that is the social and economic reality.

Attached to our brief are copies of the original social charter of the European Community, which was originally passed more than 30 years ago, in 1961. We would invite committee members to take some time to read over that, because when you look at the detail of the kinds of social rights, in particular they spent a fair bit of time in their social charter looking at employment issues and workers' rights and they go into such detail as paid maternity leave for women, they guarantee full employment, they talk about vocational programs for workers, they talk about protecting children from moral hazard, and the lists go on and on. It is quite a comprehensive document, especially as it relates to employment issues, and we think that Canada in its constitutional considerations should be looking at expanding the charter to include a social and economic dimension.

In addition in our presentation, we have also included some commentary on the social charter by the European Trade Union Confederation. This was a statement adopted by the executive committee of that confederation in 1988 called *Creating the European Social Dimension in the Internal Market*. In particular, they talk about the need for what they call incorporating social realities and necessities into the liberal context of free trade. I think that it is especially important in Canada, as we talk about continuing the lunacy of free trade and extending it south to Mexico, that we talk about social realities and social necessities. They talk about social cohesion in this document, and again I would commend to committee members this particular document from the European Trade Union Confederation as raising a number of social and economic issues.

Finally, we have included a document from the European Community, a resolution of the European Parliament dated 13 September 1990, which is its social charter and community action plan, and again, this charter deals with a number of issues. We think that it is quite crucial that as we look at Confederation in Canada we look at extending our charter to include social and economic dimensions.

Finally, I would like to say very briefly that we believe it is important, in addition to looking at substantive issues around social and economic rights, it is also critical that this committee look at extending democratic rights. Under our current charter the only democratic right that is given to Canadians is the right to vote in elections. Beyond that, there are no democratic rights to participate in important decision-making processes of government.

We saw the consequence of that in terms of Meech Lake, where 11 men were locked up in a room and were given the task of redesigning this country. Clearly that was a process most Canadians found abhorrent, but it happens on a daily basis with many other decisions. We think that a charter has to recognize the right of Canadians to participate in decision-making processes. And I say in conclusion that part of that right of participation has to include resources to social advocacy groups and an expansion of the current, very limited program of intervenor funding in various aspects of government issues so that communities can

begin to organize, identify in a comprehensive way their needs, their concerns, and be able to make much more effective interventions at the government level.

1430

So we want to say that in addition to substantive rights in terms of a social and economic charter, we also think there has to be a recognition of democratic rights. In addition, these democratic rights have to extend not simply in terms of individuals' dealings with government but also democratic rights in the workplace, democratic rights in the marketplace and even democratic rights in the home sphere. In all those issues, we think it is very, very important that our Constitution take up those concerns.

Ms Borowy: Just following from what Michael has said, Bread Not Circuses has always made two points when we question what the priorities are: First, we have asked which issues are on top of the agenda and in whose terms those issues are actually defined; and, second, we have asked how much control people really have in the decision-making process and how the voices of historically oppressed people—from the native community, francophones, labour, women, different race and ethnic groups, gays and lesbians—have been heard.

Unfortunately, although the Silipo commission appears to be a step in the right direction, we would argue that to simply focus on historically defined questions of biculturalism, of francophones versus anglophones, and on questions of region is in fact a misguided approach to understanding our Constitution. Our argument, following from what Michael has said, is that we have to recognize that we are in a time of crisis, and that crisis is not a constitutional one but a crisis of everyday living. There are as many as 20,000 people homeless in the city of Toronto alone. As Gerard will explain, there are over 120,000 people lining up at food banks each month. There is a plant shutting down at the rate of one a week, at least in Toronto, and what is happening is that the industrial and manufacturing base is being replaced by short-term, low-wage service and tourist sector jobs.

So our point is simply this, that in the face of this crisis of everyday living we should not be concentrating on the new cultural megaproject of trying to figure out where francophones fit in, where the different regions fit in, but we have to refocus the entire debate in terms of basic social and economic questions. Following from that, we are arguing that we need a very specific social and economic charter to take over the dominant discussion and that part and parcel with that is the refocusing of democratic rights through the use of intervenor funding which puts real resources into people's hands, directly into their hands, as the process that has to be followed up.

Having said that, it is over to Colin.

Mr Hughes: Hi, my name is Colin Hughes and I am with the Child Poverty Action Group.

Canadians have become increasingly aware of the fact of child poverty and its terrible consequences. Children are the single-largest group of poor people in Canada today. On average, one Canadian child in six faces the risk of the theft of their future. There is nothing mysterious about

child poverty or why it exists: Children are poor because their parents are poor. Children are poverty's youngest victims.

Poverty and inequality are interrelated, and this should be a primary concern for Canadians. Children in low-income families, aboriginal children and children from economically deprived regions of Canada have been the primary victims. Canada has already agreed to international laws on economic, social and cultural rights and the rights of children. These laws assert rights around an adequate standard of living, adequate food, clothing, housing, health, education, child care and so on. Entrenching economic and social equality in Canada should be a basic aspiration of the people of Ontario.

In November 1989 members of Parliament voted unanimously in favour of a motion to eliminate poverty among Canadian children by the year 2000. To achieve this goal, national policies will need to be in place by the year 1996. Eliminating child poverty in Canada requires the introduction of effective social and economic policies that can address the economic conditions of families with children. A social floor of economic opportunities and public entitlements would endow families, would keep them in the economic mainstream and would keep them from falling into poverty in the first place.

The following are essential national policies: first, a social floor of economic opportunities consisting of adequate employment income, government income security programs and a fair and progressive taxation system that recognizes the presence of children; second, appropriate and affordable family housing; third, universally accessible, high-quality child care and parental and family responsibility leave; and, finally, access to essential health and social services that are racially and culturally sensitive.

The province of Ontario must adopt and promote public policies aimed at eliminating child poverty as a nationally shared interest. This is all the more important given that this federal government is headed in the opposite policy direction. The federal government has been dismantling existing social policies, particularly those that support families. For example, the federal government has de-indexed family allowances and introduced the claw-back, it has cut back on unemployment insurance by making fewer people eligible and it has capped the Canada assistance plan. There are other examples. The recent federal government announcement of further cuts to national programs makes matters even worse. The dismantling of Canada's social programs creates greater economic hardship for families with children. Instead of working to eliminate child poverty, this federal government's policies will increase the incidence, depth and persistence of child poverty. To quote the Vancouver-based group End Legislated Poverty, "If the federal government wants to end child poverty, stop creating it."

There are also implications for national unity. Canada's social programs are among the strings that bind us together as a nation. Ensuring comparable program standards and portability nationally in areas such as income security, health care and education is a very concrete example of nationhood for most people. To decrease the federal contribution and role in these programs will lead to a patchwork

of programs and entitlements across Canada and this will provide less reason to be committed to Canada. The federal government simply cannot have it both ways. They cannot simultaneously unify and dismember a country. Ontario should provide leadership in convincing the federal government to play a unifying role.

We thank the select committee for allowing us a few moments to advocate that eliminating poverty nationally, which translates into social and economic justice, be an important consideration of Ontario in Confederation.

Mr Kennedy: My name is Gerard Kennedy. I am with an organization called the Daily Bread Food Bank. We welcome this limited opportunity to take part in the committee and hope to bring to you a perspective that may not be coming up from any other source. Only part of that is the work that we do on a day-to-day basis.

You are looking at the Constitution, the future of Canada. For the people who are attending food banks, for the people who are serving them on the other side of the counter, it seems very distant and very removed, yet there is a palpable feeling that there has to be something in your mandate today that is worth fighting for.

When you look at the challenge that is presented today, an extra 50,000 children attending food banks in the last six months, we have something in the order of 590,000 people—225,000 children—part of a food bank experience in this country in the past year, and Ontario has 108,000 of those children. In this province 275,000 Ontarians are begging for food because of our lack of national social and community purpose.

I would not concede my ability to represent certainly the people who are turning to food banks, but my observation from the window that food banks provide on natural hardship in our community is that that leadership is a component that has to be factored into any way you frame your findings from the hearings you are holding. There is a strong feeling on the part of the people that they are disfranchised, that it is a complete disfranchisement when in this type of modern society we reach below a certain level of economic entitlement. The definition of that, whether it reaches into a charter or an elaborate charter of the type that was mentioned by Michael Shapcott, needs to be considered not just on the sour or negative aspect of deteriorating social conditions but on a positive basis. We have to decide where we are going to agree, and the fundamentals that we talk about as a country cannot be more fundamental than that, than providing for those who are most vulnerable.

When we look across the cross-section of people who have been disfranchised by social and economic policies over the last several years, the undereducated, the people who have health and family circumstances which make them vulnerable, it adds up to an aggression on the part of the rest of society that does not fit well with the way those people were led to believe they could participate in society.

1440

The other perspective I would bring in, perhaps with a little bit more confidence, is on the side of a constituency of people out there who are bloody well concerned with the state of the country, and those are the kind of people

who have been, by some sort of act of nature, almost supporting the food banks. There is nothing organized or industrialized about the food bank industry. It is happening because it taps into a reservoir that you should really be aware of. It is an attitude on the part of citizens in this country that we can do much, much, much better than giving people handouts, that there is something missing not just from the traditions that we have talked about, as having a kinder, gentler country, but for the forward direction of where we are going to go.

There are not dozens of those people; there are hundreds and thousands of people who have taken part in food drives. And they are doing it—and in recent times it is even more pronounced—not just for their own feelings of self-worth; it really is based out of almost a desperate need to help define this country in terms of its attitudes towards all of its citizens. That feeling is, again, something very palpable that we are a conduit for at food banks. It is something that you need to be aware of, and yet we are stymied in terms of where government leadership is going to take us in terms of its authority to implement programs. Rather than look at things on a fiscal, economic, calculated accountant-type basis, there need to be some values in terms where we are going to present ourselves, and that is what people are at the same time distrusting government to bring forward in terms of being able to spend their money and bring about those results and yet desperately looking for.

If you want to understand the food bank phenomenon, one of those is as an outlet for that type of almost anxious need on the part of many, many Canadians. The social human dimension needs to have a framework, and it needs to be part of the basic framework. I strongly believe, out of my seven years of involvement in this field, that is something that many Canadians are yearning for. It cuts across language and geographic barriers. When we look at the overall context of trying to adapt with a level of humanitarianism to the rapid changes that are taking place economically and socially, we need to have a framework where people are sure of plugging in, of participating. As food banks, as people who have been seeing a tragedy happening on a day-to-day basis, we have not had that place to plug in. There is a very poor sense that there is a way for people to listen, that there is a way for active people to participate. We have doctors, lawyers, engineers and poor people working side by side packing food. That energy has to go someplace else. It has to have a place in whatever you come up with as a framework, and you as a committee have to not be afraid to talk about values and the dimensions of things that other people would call soft and fuzzy.

Because it is not all going to be done legally, it is not all going to be done economically, and when the proposition time comes to speak to Quebec and to the other parts of the country, things like a national plan to deal with poverty and, as was said, a social floor of entitlements for this country should be put on the table. Ontario should be prepared to make that a national issue, a binding national issue, because the jurisdictionism around social programs and the balkanization there has already taken place, and it is part of the lassitude that people have in terms of their

confidence in this country. I think you will find those kinds of views if you make the time and take the time to listen to more of the people who are affected by poverty and more of the people who have taken an active interest in it. I would certainly recommend to you on the rest of your agenda to make an extra effort to involve more groups than the ones that are before you today.

Ms Hayes: My name is Marnie Hayes and I am speaking on behalf of the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty this afternoon. For those of you who do not know, the coalition against poverty is made up of a number of grass-roots antipoverty groups across the province, and we are here, as are, I guess, all the other groups on your agenda this afternoon, many of them, to speak to you about the growing situation of poverty. The groups that were before me quoted many statistics that sort of set the tone to remind you of the crisis situation of poverty that we have in Ontario and in Canada at this time. We would like to say that as the federal government proceeds with its conservative agenda we believe it is incumbent on Ontario to take the lead in ensuring that the right to adequate housing, food and clothing is afforded to all the citizens of Ontario.

As we look at justice and equality in our Constitution, they are very important elements in our democratic society, and our right to be protected from discrimination, as enshrined in both the Constitution and in the Ontario Human Rights Code, is a very noble principle. However, concepts like equality and freedom and things that have been pointed out by the people before me, those terms can be mere rhetoric to a single mother, for example, who is living on welfare and who is required to get a letter of permission from her welfare worker in order to get a bag of groceries from the local food bank to feed her children. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms must serve all the people of Canada, by guaranteeing economic and social rights as well as civil and political rights. Different schemes have been outlined before me. I believe someone spoke to you this morning about the fact that Canada and Ontario are signatories to the United Nations declaration on economic, social and cultural rights. We believe that Ontario, starting with this committee, should take the lead in pointing that out and in using that as a mechanism to ensure all Ontarians the right to adequate housing, food and clothing.

I am wearing a button that says, "Housing is a Right," but in fact housing—as we see, there are more than 40,000 homeless people living in Ontario—is not indeed a right. We believe that it is clearly a question of priorities and political will in order to alleviate poverty in this province, and while the elimination of poverty can be done in Ontario, we believe Ontario must take a clear stand in doing that.

In terms of the Constitution and in terms of this committee's mandate, we believe it is important that you consider the rights of all citizens, but at the same time we believe that the upcoming provincial budget should be a place where the government puts its money where its mouth is, so to speak, and actually puts money into alleviating the suffering that poor people are dealing with on a daily basis right now.

For example, the Ontario government should put more money into affordable housing and into increasing the wel-

fare rates, as well as enshrining rights into the Constitution, but actually put money immediately into those priorities.

The Chair: Are there other speakers? We will have time for questions, actually. I appreciate the fact that you have left some time.

Let me just say to you that we accept the criticism at the beginning of your presentation in asking you to come together in this way, but let me also say to you that I think, having listened to what you have told us, that from our perspective as a committee it has actually been more powerful and more useful for that to have happened, because you have focused for us very clearly an area that I think we recognize we need to spend more time on. Although we had heard from other organizations throughout our hearings on some of the issues you have discussed, bringing organizations like yours that deal with the effect of poverty on people and different kinds of people, from children to families to adults, together in this way has been quite useful for us.

I have a question in terms of some process we want to follow, but I want to let the other members of the committee get their questions in first.

Mr Beer: Thank you for the presentation. I would just concur that I think having all in one fell swoop really allows us to focus on it.

Two things: When we deal with the Constitution issue it can often sound sort of airy-fairy, something that only certain people deal with. But I think in terms of the mandate of this committee and what we were asked to go out and do, we were to find out what people's economic and social concerns were. I think that was done with a point, so what you were talking about is every bit as valid as constitutional material, if you like, as the more traditional things, and I think there is an acceptance by all of us that those are areas we have to deal with, and Michael, the things you drew our attention to, I think we have to look at those.

1450

I would only say that as we do that, which is, if you like, perhaps somewhat new, or at least we have not done that much of it, we still do have to grapple with some of the more perhaps standard issues that have faced us in the country, because with all of the problems you have referred to, it is my view that in the event that Quebec separated, the consequences of that for the whole country, certainly in the short and middle term, would just exacerbate every economic and social issue and problem we are facing in terms of all of those unknowns.

I guess my only point is that I think what you are speaking to is very much at the heart of what we are doing and I think when we come to our final report we are going to have to be dealing with some of those issues, because we are talking about values.

Again, Gerard, when you talked about the sort of energy and the people you see through your window, both those who are using the food banks and those who come and work and provide their time and effort, the kinds of concerns they are expressing—I mean, those are real. They are being expressed by other people who come before us.

So I think it is important to meet you, I hope, at that point where you are speaking from.

The issue, then, is the extent to which, in enshrining those economic and social rights within the Constitution versus the things that, quite frankly, we could be doing or ought to be doing, whether it was us pre-September 6 or the present government, in terms of alleviating the broad range of poverty concerns that you speak to—would I be right in saying that the key thing about having those enshrined as they have in Europe is simply that it means there is something to really speak to, something to link the legislative proposals, the government programs and policies you want to see us follow, because in fact you can go back to that charter and show very clearly, "Look, there's a reference to a right to housing," to certain economic rights that may be spelled out, whatever those would be?

Mr Shapcott: If I could take up that issue—maybe George wants to jump in as well—I think it is important to say that one of the reasons these need to be identified as issues is first of all to even get on the public agenda. At the moment there is a certain view that seems to be a dominant view, within the federal government anyway, that poverty is the fault of the individual, that people merely need to exert a bit of initiative and they can lift themselves by their bootstraps, and we hear that in 100 different ways. The actual process of putting these rights into the Constitution is saying no, these are in fact broad issues which society is broadly concerned about, and when there are poor people in our society it is not simply something a poor person needs to be concerned about but is in fact a social concern.

It is quite true that the mere fact of putting these kinds of rights into charters does not solve the problem. I would be willing to guess that in Europe there are all sorts of pressing social, political and economic issues, notwithstanding all of the wonderful language they have in their various social charters, both the old one and the most recent one. Nevertheless, it provides an important focus.

But I think we also have to understand—and we tried to make this point perhaps too quickly in our presentation, Gerard made some reference to this in his presentation—that you have to couple rights with resources for people to be able to realize those rights in very tangible ways, that it does no good simply to give rights in the abstract and then not give people the ability to access them. When you were minister I am sure you found this to be the case: The voice of poor people in our society is a very marginalized voice, it is often very silent, and what is needed is to provide resources to allow poor people to begin to more clearly articulate both their concerns and, more important, to be part of the agents for the solution. So we think that enshrining both substantive rights and also democratic rights, expanding the notion of democratic rights and resources to realize those rights, will in fact move us ahead very, very substantially.

Ms Borowy: I would also just like to pick up the point of democratic rights. Part of that is the right to self-determination, and if we are to extend that most fully, that may include the people of Quebec. Workers of Quebec and others of Quebec may say, "To meet our full nature, to

empower ourselves, to meet our creative potential, our route may be very different than the one joining Canada."

So part and parcel of our point around democratic rights is, first, that those democratic rights are more than simply enshrined, that actual resources are given to people directly, as Michael has spoken to, and second, that is to recognize the right of self-determination. That means that instead of listening to the insurance companies and others which have traditionally gotten the voice because they have the resources, it is absolutely crucial that a wider variety of people, of repressed groups, have those rights and the right to determine what they want to do with their lives.

Mr Kennedy: In a society like this, where you have a minority poverty population, like any other minority you have to talk about rights they can depend on. The sensibilities of the average Canadian are the type that you have to put them on the spot in order to get an answer about how important something like poverty and hunger is. It is the kind of thing you could settle; you could make part of a constitutional discussion, you could make that have something that was an entitlement that people can draw on when they enter into that realm of disfranchisement.

I do not think a glory statement in the Constitution is something that should be sought. What I would recommend is that, based on the side of so many people who have been put on that spot, challenged to say what they would believe in—it has been a standing assumption, and unfortunately what we have found in the last several years is that the assumption that Canada provides, that there is compassion and caring and beyond that some sense of justice, has been proven to be false.

If you look at just what has happened to the Canada assistance plan, legislation that was a point of departure in 1967 is not good enough, because what the Supreme Court rules on that may show us that we do not have even that practical feature. We do not have, in 10 years of a Charter of Rights, a single challenge on socioeconomic status. We do not have protection for discrimination against people on socioeconomic grounds. Those are practical, meat and potato things that could be employed on a day-to-day basis and used.

The other thing I would like to add is that while self-determination can be brought right down to the community level, I think we also have to have mind for what fundamental things would be part of any agreement between peoples, and I think the social nature—some basic definition of that is something I would strongly recommend would both find support and is necessary right across the country.

Ms Churley: I think you answered my question when somebody said you have to couple rights with resources, so I will not ask the question. What I will say is, thanks for putting what I believe this is all about in perspective. Somebody said it seems like it is all soft and fuzzy, and we talk about asymmetrical democracy and amending formulas and things like that a lot, and there is a sense that if you talk about, say, the soft and fuzzy, then you are not serious and you are not really to be taken seriously. I guess I just wanted to say that you have put it in perspective and what this is really all about is for people.

So my question now is, given that this is the beginning of a process of bringing people in, do you have any recommendations, or do you want to think about that, beyond what you have said about the process from here on in, in terms of making sure that the voices you are talking about are heard and that this does not get lost in the shuffle?

The Chair: Let me mention before you answer, because that was along the lines of what I wanted to ask, and maybe explain, because it might help in terms of how you address that point, the hearings that will conclude today for us will lead to an interim report that we will put together by 21 March. Following that and the end of June, there will be as part of our process some further discussions. We are at the point in the next couple of weeks of trying to think about what kind of shape that process of discussion should take, and one of the things we have begun to take a look at are ways of bringing people from different particular perspectives and interests and constituencies together, just to put that in a framework in asking for your feedback on that.

1500

Mr Shapcott: This is something Bread Not Circuses has felt very strongly about for some time. Indeed, when our coalition formed, as people may be aware, our concerns were about some megaprojects being proposed in the city of Toronto. Marilyn Churley was on the city council. Our principle concern then was that people had been effectively excluded from the process, and one of the big issues that we were working with Marilyn Churley on when she was on council, and others, was to try to create an effective process to allow people to have some sort of meaningful role in the process and not just simply to be a token consultation and then off in whatever direction the politicians were intending to go anyway.

We think there are a number of elements that are useful in terms of an ongoing process that provides some meaningful intervention on the part of people. We think in essence it has to be seen as a two-way process, that there is a responsibility that this government and this committee has to communicate information out to people to identify issues this committee through its work to date and the government have identified as being concerns they want people to consider. So information flyers in a variety of forms and languages and so on to get information out to people and to be widely distributed is certainly a first part of the process.

We think there has to be some provision made for something that, for lack of a better word, we have called in the past and we called at the city of Toronto "intervenor funding." What we mean by intervenor funding is the kind of practical resources to allow communities of interest to be able to come together, to, if necessary, hire experts to look into issues they think are important, but more important, just to give them the practical resources to come together within their own community of interests to study issues and then to begin to propose solutions and make proposals to the committee. We think that will then make this a two-way process. It is not simply this committee and this government and the Legislature sending material out into the great void, but it is also people out in various communities

having the ability and the resources to be able to create a more articulate response and feed material back in.

That is what we mean by a two-way process, and call it an intervenor fund if you want. That seems to be something familiar to government because it does that in other issues. Whether it is energy hearings or so on, it allows communities of interest to organize themselves and to make more effective interventions. We think that is part of it.

We certainly think there is a need for an ongoing consultation process that may include as part of it information hearings and other formal hearings along this line, but we would also say that this process only gets you a certain distance.

Jan may want to jump in in terms of specifics, but I think what we found in terms of our work with the city of Toronto was that although we do not think the process ultimately was a perfect process, it certainly was an attempt to create a two-way flow of information to get important information into the hands of people in a form that was accessible and available to them and to give people the resources to be able to respond and feed back in the process. So we think that is what is necessary.

Ms Borowy: I would just like to add that on page 3 of our brief we have outlined—the other hat, I should mention, I wear is that I am a political scientist, a graduate student up at York University, and the point I would like to make is a historical one in supporting the notion of direct intervenor funding and resources going straight into the hands of the various repressed and marginalized groups.

Historically Canada has been largely divided along regional lines, so that has meant that many of the marginalized groups have so often advocated positions based on issues of region, and it seems to me that one thing that is absolutely crucial is that the marginalized groups from Ontario—the poor, women, workers—are able to consistently talk to each other across this country and across other provinces as they begin to define what is most urgent.

Now the social charter is one point, and it can be seen as a very important starting point for those discussions, but what then needs to happen is the final resources, to even simply send out mailings, which is something that many people forget is an extraordinarily expensive process, to even begin that process must be done with very direct resources. One idea we used to throw around was the notion of conference calls. For a businessman it is very simple; you pick up the phone and you organize a conference call. Marginalized people do not have that option, so we need firm and concrete resources directly into the hands of many of the groups to start to organize along these questions.

The Chair: Any other comments?

Mr Kennedy: I would just reflect that Mr Beer was part of a meeting that was organized by various community groups, people on welfare and people who had some observations; 200 people showed up and I think gave a perspective at a church downtown.

I think there are two things. You are going to have to make the invitation and you are going to have to do it in a way that is meaningful, because most of the people we are

talking about in terms of the people who need to be factored in are not organized, and some considerable effort has to go into that; not necessarily making them organized, but getting access to them. Going to them is one way you can do that, and going to them in a straight up fashion that starts to speak to the sense of disfranchisement they feel.

However, making the invitation means your recognition that that point of view is important, and I would include in this the people who are in the church and community groups that are holding up the end for governments that cannot make up their mind whether they want to support basic social programs or not. You are going to have to reach out to them. You are going to have to show them that your concerns include that feature of society, and I do not think right now anybody would associate the constitutional dialogue with social conditions in this country. I think you, as elected politicians, have both a moral and an obvious responsibility to do that.

The Chair: Once again, thanks very much. You have put before us, as I said before, very clearly some important issues that I think we need to address very squarely. I expect that we will be talking to you directly about some of the details of how we can approach both the issues and the process around some of those suggestions you have given to us.

COMMUNIST LEAGUE CANDIDATES
FOR MAYOR OF TORONTO AND MONTREAL
CANDIDATS DE LA LIGUE COMMUNISTE
POUR LE POSTE DE MAIRE
DE TORONTO ET DE MONTRÉAL

The Chair: I invite our next presenters, the Communist League candidates for mayor of Toronto and Montreal.

Mr Dugré: Mr Chair, members of the committee, I would like to start first with a few words in French.

Je m'appelle Michel Dugré. J'étais candidat de la Ligue communiste aux élections à la mairie de Montréal qui ont eues lieu à l'automne dernier et je suis membre des Métallurgistes unis d'Amérique. Ici à mes côté il y a Joe Young, qui est le candidat de la Ligue communiste aux élections à la mairie qui vont avoir lieu à Toronto cet automne et il est membre de l'Association internationale des machinistes.

On a pensé que c'était important qu'un syndicaliste comme moi et un travailleur québécois viennent ici en Ontario pour défendre les droits des Québécois, en particulier contre les politiques qui ont été suivies jusqu'à maintenant par le gouvernement de l'Ontario.

One aspect of these policies is the denial by the Ontario government of the right of Québécois to determine their own future. But the support among Québécois for Quebec sovereignty has now reached the highest level ever. In a poll that was published last Saturday, 83% of Québécois questioned said they were supporting either a form of very profound autonomy of Quebec inside the Canadian federation or Quebec independence, which was totally new. So far the governments outside Quebec, especially in Ottawa and Toronto, have said they would never accept separation of Quebec.

The first point to make on that is that the question of the future of Quebec will not be decided or determined by

the Ontario government or the Canadian government. This is not to these governments to decide on the future of Quebec. That is the fundamental question. The question is who is going to decide, and we say that Québécois alone should have the right to decide their own future.

The government of Ontario has expressed concern about the rights of anglophones in Quebec, and many politicians in Canada, both in Quebec and outside Quebec, have expressed support for the rights of oppressed nationalities in the Soviet Union, for example. The hypocrisy of this position is just to illustrate once again that, closer to home, the same politicians do not respect the rights of oppressed nationalities either in Quebec or here with the Franco-Ontarian, who do not have one tenth of the rights of the anglophones in Quebec.

1510

What is at stake here is not a question of minority, it is not a question of provinces' rights or power, it is not a question of geography or territory. It is above all essentially a question of democracy. Do we support the right of oppressed nationalities in Canada to decide their own future? That is the question; there is nothing else. And we say that from Lithuania to Quebec, we support the rights of all oppressed nations to determine their own future.

Québécois are an oppressed nationality that suffers systematic discrimination simply because we are a French-speaking minority within Canada. In 1985, anglophones in Quebec earned on average more than \$3,000 more than francophones. Even unilingual anglophones earned more than bilingual francophones. In 1968, while the population of Quebec represented a little bit more than a quarter of the population in Canada, almost one third of all Canadians living below the poverty line lived in Quebec and 36.6% of those living on welfare were also living in Quebec.

Since this country was founded, Québécois have never had the governmental powers necessary to overcome the systematic oppression. They never had the right to freely determine their own future. For example, the British North America Act of 1867 imposed a segregated school system on Quebec divided along both language and religious lines. At the same time, it declared any efforts by the people of Quebec to change this segregated and religious character of its schools, including according to the Constitution of 1982, unconstitutional. It is because of this systematic denial of their rights within the Canadian federal system that today the large majority of Québécois support the demand for political sovereignty.

Reflecting this reality, the Quebec Liberal Party in Allaire's report proposed that the Quebec government be granted full sovereignty over 22 areas of government jurisdiction currently shared with or under the domain of Ottawa. We support these demands as the minimum necessary for recognition of Quebec's rights. The idea of a cross-Canada referendum to determine Quebec's relationship to Canada is completely undemocratic. It is only the people of Quebec who should have the right to decide their own future relationship to Canada.

In the same vein, we also support the rights of native peoples, whose land was stolen from them, initially by this country's British and French colonial rulers and subsequently

by the government of the new Canadian Confederation. The majority of the native peoples in this country live in Third World conditions. They are subjected to systematic, institutionalized racism. The rate of unemployment is extremely high. The life expectancy is eight years less than the average for the Canadian population as a whole. We fully support native land claims and demands for political sovereignty, which are preconditions for their capacity to overcome the degrading system of oppression that has been imposed on them by force and violence.

Now Joe will end this presentation.

Mr Young: Mr Chair, committee members, my name is Joe Young. I am the Communist League candidate for mayor of Toronto.

First I would like to say I agree entirely with what Michel said on the right of the Québécois to determine their own future with no outside interference.

Today the Globe and Mail reports that Robert Rae has refused to make Ontario a bilingual province, and I would like to condemn that stand, which is also the stand of all the other parties in the Legislature, a stand that refuses to recognize the rights of Franco-Ontarians. At the same time, the Premier and the other parties dare to lecture Quebec on staying in Canada.

Franco-Ontarians, as I am sure this committee has heard many times, are subjected to discrimination on the basis of their language, as are francophones across Canada. This committee has been the witness to the chauvinist campaign of various groups that campaign for so-called English rights. But the fact is, as Michel explained, while anglophones in Quebec enjoy a wide range of rights and privileges—except for blacks, for example—Franco-Ontarians continue to be assimilated in large numbers because of the oppression of their rights.

A majority of Franco-Ontarian children do not have access to French-language schools. The rate of illiteracy is much higher among Franco-Ontarians. Far fewer finish high school, university. They are concentrated in unskilled, low-paying jobs. They suffer from higher unemployment.

The facts are clear. This is why the Communist League supports recognizing French as an official language in Ontario. We call for the extension of the public French-language school system on all levels, including community colleges and universities, that is, French-language universities, French-language community colleges. We think that French-language schools should be built wherever there is a demand for them and not with this limit that exists now of where there are 5,000 francophones or 10% of the population. The teaching of a second language should be available wherever there is a need for it.

We also think there should be affirmative action programs to ensure that Franco-Ontarians have access to better-paying jobs.

Taking a stand against discrimination in this country must also include the defence of our Arab brothers and sisters who are being subjected to arrest and harassment in the context of Washington-London-Ottawa's war against the people of Iraq. For example, two Iraqis have been held since 9 January right here in Toronto by order of Barbara McDougall, who is the Minister of Employment and Immigration,

despite the fact that an immigration adjudicator ordered their release, and scores of homes of people of Arab origin have been visited by agents of CSIS, which is Canada's political police.

The fact is that there is a long history in Canada of fighters for the rights of Québécois, the rights of native people, people who oppose war, unionists, being spied upon and harassed by police agencies. The dirty tricks of the RCMP against the Quebec independence movement are very well known. We know also that CSIS has extensive files on the peace movement, on unionists, that native people are continually being spied upon, harassed, if not arrested and even killed by the police.

I myself am a victim of CSIS harassment at the airport, where I work for Air Canada, and I am a member of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. For 16 months I have been denied security clearance at the airport. I have been interrogated by two CSIS agents who asked me questions about my political views, about my sexual orientation and other questions.

Here is just a little example of the kind of questions they posed. They asked me, "Are you an adherent of or in favour of the democratic system of government as practised in Canada?" I asked them, "What is the purpose of that?" "Well, for example, if you're not a proponent of the system of government we enjoy here and you supported a foreign government which espoused a political ideology which was a threat to ours, you may be willing to work for that government against Canada." I replied that that was not a pertinent question; they did not have the right to ask me that question. In fact I have copies of this interrogation which I got from CSIS, if committee members or others here want to see it.

So I feel that part of recognizing the rights of those who suffer discrimination and oppression in this country is putting an end to this victimization. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. Are there any questions?

Mr Beer: I think a lot of the rights you speak to are certainly valid ones and ones that we are concerned about. I have to take exception at least to what I understand you to say about Quebec and the rest of the country in terms of the discussions we are going through right now. It seems to me very legitimate and I can see having not only an interest but a democratic interest in talking with my friends and relatives and others in Quebec about a decision that at some point they may well vote on. I have not heard anybody saying that Quebec does not have a right to have a referendum regarding its future, and clearly, even if we were to say, "You can't do that," they could go ahead and do it. But we are still at this point all Canadians. We are still part of the same country, and I do not think it is a question of interference if individual Canadians want to become involved in that debate and to work in a democratic and open way with other Quebecers who may bring about a decision different from separation. I may have misunderstood you, but it seemed to me that you were suggesting that we had no legitimate role in that decision, and it seems to me we do.

1520

Mr Dugré: I think discussing this question outside Quebec is good. It is extremely important. In fact, I am absolutely convinced that in the end we will succeed in convincing the vast majority of the population outside Quebec of the right of Québécois to decide and determine their own future. I think having this discussion is good.

But the fact is that this right to decide is not recognized to Québécois, and the experience of the last 10 years—not to go back to the conscription crisis of 1942, but just the last 10 years—shows that. Every step that has been made by the Canadian government and other governments in Canada was to reduce the rights of Québécois, not to increase their rights. The Constitution of 1982, the heart of that new so-called democratic Constitution, was to reduce the rights of the Québécois on the central question, the right to control education and language, clause 23 of the famous Charter of Rights. And even the little things that were in the Meech Lake agreement were denied to the Québécois, and for many people outside Quebec, because there was too much given to the Québécois. It is these experiences, this experience of the so-called democratic Constitution of 1982—what was its real content—and the experience of Meech Lake and the experience of the Canadian Supreme Court denying the right of the Quebec government to legislate on language. Denying the content of law 101, for example, is just that, a denying of the right of Québécois to decide for themselves, and that is the history of Canada. That is why a vast majority of people today in Quebec support the sovereignty of Quebec, because they do not see any other solution inside this federal system.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for presenting to us today. I just want to clarify two points specifically. You talked about the rights of francophone Ontarians being in a worse state than anglophones in Quebec, even though we do have Bill 101 and Bill 178 in Quebec and those in many ways deny anglophones' rights. You drew that parallel. I would like you to clarify that, and also the second point: you have said that you think the committee should consider the rights of the choice of freedom preference for any political group, that that should be entrenched in the Constitution. Is that right?

Mr Young: Could you just repeat that last question?

Mr Malkowski: You were saying that you wanted the committee to put within the Constitution that any group should be allowed to have preference to appoint any political group. Is that correct?

Mr Young: Preference to appoint any political group?

Mr Malkowski: You had talked about CSIS agents and so on harassing you and that you should have a right to any political views.

Mr Young: Okay. First, on the situation of anglophones—other than blacks, who I do think suffer discrimination in Quebec—I do not agree with Bill 178, which says that exterior signs can only be in French. I think that is a violation of democratic rights and that as long as signs are in French in Quebec, I think people should be able to put signs up in any language that they wish. I think that is a democratic position to take.

That being said, when you look at the position of anglophones in Quebec, and I lived there for 15 years, and you look at the institutions that are available, the whole separate school system in English, the hospitals and so on, it is very clear that the situation of anglophones in Quebec is not one of denial of rights but in fact their socioeconomic position, their wages, unemployment, you name it, is much better than, for example, Franco-Ontarians, who do suffer, in my opinion, a very serious discrimination. Any comparison I think will show that.

On the question of political views, certainly I do not think anyone should be harassed, spied upon, what have you, for their political views. I mean, CSIS has alleged no criminal acts, nothing of this kind. All this has to do with my political opinions, my personal life. They asked me about my sexual proclivity; I do not know where they found that particular word. That is a violation of rights, for example, of people who are gay in this country to say that, "You might be a risk to the security of this country because of your sexual orientation, because of your political views and so on." I think it is outrageous that someone should be denied security clearance working at the airport, where it is a real problem for my work, and I am not the only one. Other members of my union, the international association of machinists, have been subjected to this. My union has taken this up and it is continuing to fight this, but I think it is something that should clearly be an established right in this country.

The Chair: Okay, thank you very much. We will end there.

Mr Young: Thank you.

PERSONS UNITED FOR SELF-HELP IN ONTARIO

The Chair: Could I invite next representatives from Persons United for Self-Help.

Mr Decter: My name is Richard Decter. I am here in the place of Francine Arseneault, who is the co-ordinator of PUSH, who has a family emergency. We also would like to apologize before we start for not having our brief. We have had a few computer problems in preparing it, but one will be forthcoming.

I would like to introduce John Southern, who is on staff at PUSH, and also Sam Savona, who is also on staff at PUSH. John and I are going to be speaking on behalf of our organization. I think that the most important thing to start with is to have John introduce, to those who are not familiar with us, what Persons United for Self-Help is.

Mr Southern: Could I ask the committee to introduce itself? I would just like to know how many people I am talking to and things like that.

Mr F. Wilson: Fred Wilson. I am MPP for Frontenac-Addington, which is down by Kingston area.

Mr Malkowski: Gary Malkowski. You are hearing from the right, but I am sitting on the left.

The Acting Chair (Ms Churley): And I am Marilyn Churley, who has taken over the Chair from Tony Silipo, who had to wheel out for a few minutes.

Mr Beer: I am Charles Beer from York North, and, John, we have had the pleasure of meeting before. Nice to see you again.

Mr Southern: Thank you very much. Just for those who do not know, and I know Gary could tell you this, could do my presentation for me probably, PUSH Ontario is cross-disability. That means we are made up of all disabilities, as many as we can get involved, anyway, of disabled people in the province of Ontario. We are a provincial-wide organization. We have been formed for 10 years now.

I guess the major difference in our group is that we try to ensure that persons with disabilities control their own lives, have their own say in their own lives and lobby or advocate for themselves for what they think is important. Up until the mid-1970s, there was no such thing as self-help, or very little of it, for disabled people in Canada, and I think the self-help movement has achieved a lot, although we have still got a long way to go. The only groups that were around were groups for disabled people. We are of disabled people. I think there is a big difference that needs to be made. The groups for disabled people, like the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the March of Dimes, are charitable organizations that provide services to disabled people but for the most part have never involved disabled people in the major decision-making in their organizations. I guess we thought that was wrong, and that is why we decided, various disabled people in the province, to try and right that somewhat and advocate on our own behalf.

PUSH links nationally to a group called the Coalition of Provincial Organizations of the Handicapped. COPOH is a co-ordinating body that tries to bring all the provincial groups together on issues of importance. COPOH has made presentations nationally on the Constitution, and Richard will highlight some of their presentations in his presentation.

I will pass it over to Richard Decter. We have tried to decide what he actually is, but I guess he co-ordinates and manages our office and tries to keep us all in check, although sometimes we have to keep him in check.

1530

Mr Decter: I think one of the first things to point out is that it is doubly important that people with disabilities be directly represented in the process of reform of the Constitution, because people with disabilities are discriminated against on a regular basis in the electoral process and chronically underrepresented in the Legislature. Despite the presence of Mr Malkowski here, that is true even in the Ontario Legislature. Statistically, between 10% and 14% of the general population has a significant disability. If between 10% and 14% of the Ontario Legislature had a significant disability, we would be dealing with more than a dozen members.

More pertinent, perhaps, is that, believe it or not, even as we are sitting here the city of Toronto has appealed to the Legislative Assembly for an exemption to the Municipal Act so that polling stations will not have to be made wheelchair-accessible in the next municipal election. If one

assumes that in a democracy the right to govern rests on the consent of the governed, this is a direct attempt to make the system undemocratic, or not to make it democratic. I am certainly hoping that the members of the Legislature will reject the application.

As far as the constitutional debate to date is concerned, one of the most important things in our view, and the view of COPOH, which is the national organization we belong to, is that there be a specific reference to the preservation of the rights of people with disabilities in any reform package on the Constitution. What I mean by that is that in section 15 of the existing Constitution the rights of people with disabilities are specifically mentioned. Given the historic discrimination against people with disabilities, this would seem a natural addition to the Constitution. However, it was not in the original draft of the document and I think John was among the people who were in Ottawa lobbying for that at the time. I do not know if you want to talk about that, but the Canadian Disability Rights Council and COPOH and PUSH were all involved in the fight to get that clause added, which specifically said people with physical and mental disabilities.

When the Meech Lake accord was drawn up, it was felt necessary to add to the accord, while it was being prepared, a clause that said nothing in the accord will detrimentally affect the rights of aboriginal peoples or the multicultural communities. There was no mention made—and we feel this omission was not accidental—that the accord would not affect the rights of people with disabilities or women. Again, when Premier McKenna responded with his companion proposal, he rightly included women in the groups whose rights would not be affected by Meech Lake, but once again people with disabilities were left off the list. We do not feel this is accidental; we think it has to do with the fact that people with disabilities are not present when these negotiations take place, just as there were very few women, if any, represented when Meech Lake was drawn up.

Mr Southern: I think we should maybe re-emphasize that part and underline that disabled people are more often than not absent when these kinds of negotiations take place.

Mr Decter: It is our position that even in 1991 people with disabilities are subject to widespread discrimination, and that the process of constitutional reform should not make that any easier than it presently is.

We have some other views to do with the effect of the Meech Lake accord or the previously suggested bundle of constitutional changes on the provision of social services and programs in Canada. Do you want to take that, John?

Mr Southern: I guess we were concerned that social assistance programs across Canada—well, certainly at that time we believed that federal legislation kept them at a reasonable standard. We are starting to wonder about that now. Nevertheless, I think the relationship under the Canada assistance plan and the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons Act does ensure that there are some standards that are lived up to when it comes to social assistance. If the provinces were given more power to design their own

programs, a province like Ontario, we hope it would be to the good, but we do not always know what kind of government we are going to have in power or what other provinces would do. I think it is necessary to ensure that these programs, particularly social assistance, in which I am particularly interested, are not eroded.

I think other programs could suffer too. Transportation is still high on PUSH's agenda. Provincially, we have been lobbying for years for good, accessible intercity transportation and even good transportation right here in Metro, accessible transportation. I think it is about time that disabled people or persons with disabilities were given some dignity. There are some buses where, if you have a manual wheelchair, you can fold it up and put it in the boot but you are still left to bum up the stairs on the bus. It is not very dignifying to have to board transportation that way, and I am sure Sam here could spend half a day telling you his experiences with Via Rail and the airlines in our country. If we are going to have a country, all Canadians should have access to it, and that means improved transportation.

Mr Decter: I want to underline John's point about inaccessible intercity bus transportation in Canada. There are models of wheelchair-accessible buses available in service in other countries.

Mr Southern: And in Canada, by the way.

Mr Decter: Yes, and there is no regularly scheduled, accessible bus service between Canadian cities. With the Via Rail cuts, the problem has become that people who do not drive are unable to leave their communities, particularly seeing that with deregulation of the airline industry smaller and smaller planes are being used for small communities.

The way this is relevant to the Constitution is that, to a large extent, the entire area of interprovincial bus transportation has been let slide into provincial jurisdiction, even though it remains constitutionally a matter for the federal government, and, in effect, no one is dealing with this issue.

The other point that I want to stress from what John was saying is that 60% to 90% of people with disabilities in Canada are unemployed. That means that whether they like it or not, they are currently dependent upon various forms of social assistance and income support programs for their food and shelter. When minimum standards are not enforced, people at the bottom are the ones who pay the price, and if inadvertently in the process of constitutional reform those standards are let go, then it is going to be people with disabilities, who are among the groups most commonly present on social assistance and at food banks, who are going to pay for it. I do not believe that is the intention of constitutional reform, but it should not be one of the results.

We have a couple of other points we would like to make.

Mr Southern: One point, for example: I think the rights of the disabled need to be entrenched in the Constitution because although we, being disabled people, got coverage under the Ontario Human Rights Code in 1981, and it has been improved from then to now, nevertheless the Ontario Human Rights Commission needs an awful lot of money to help deal with the cases, and it is pretty well

ineffective dealing with cases of discrimination against disabled people. So I think disabled people's rights really should be strongly entrenched in a national Constitution.

1540

Mr Decter: One of the ways we would like the federal government to look at that is through the idea of reasonable accommodation. The "distinct society" clause is, in a certain sense, an attempt to reasonably accommodate the differences of Quebecers, and it is our view that what is right for Quebecers is also right for people with disabilities. By that we mean that if justice is a kind of equality, then for people in different situations true equality is not the same treatment but treatment that corresponds equitably to their situation. Giving a single example, Mr Malkowski here is receiving sign language interpretation. That is so that he has an equal understanding of what is going on in the room. To give him the same treatment as everybody else is an equality, and we feel that applies to a large number of disabilities.

What we would like to see is some form of reasonable accommodation. The principle of reasonable accommodation, which John can explain, is in the Human Rights Code. Unfortunately, the Ontario Human Rights Commission, in its present form, is incapable of enforcing reasonable accommodation in an effective way, so we would like to see reform of that. But we would like to see reasonable accommodation in the Canadian Constitution. Maybe John can explain a bit what that means.

Mr Southern: I think your example was pretty good, but I guess reasonable accommodation—I do not know if I really like the word "reasonable," but anyway, we definitely should have good accommodation. For example, Sam might need some equipment so he can access the computer, something as inexpensive as a headpiece, a band he puts on his head with a pointer so he can access the keyboard, which costs about \$200. I think that is reasonable for anybody. On the other hand, if I want to access the computer, I need a voice output, one of these software programs to allow me to do that, which costs considerably more, but nevertheless accommodation should be made.

I do not know if in the Constitution there should be a clause that emphasizes the rights of disabled people to work, because certainly all the kinds of legislation that have been brought forward so far, both provincially and federally, have done very little to improve the lot of disabled people when it comes to employment.

I think, just to wrap this part up, every time there is anything discussed in Canada, be it human rights legislation or the Constitution or whatever legislation is before the public in this country, there are two groups tacked on at the end of all the groups that are sharing the spotlight. Native peoples and disabled people seem to be an afterthought. I cannot speak on behalf of native peoples, but certainly on behalf of disabled people it is unacceptable. Disabled people want, and in fact demand, that we be included in Canadian society if this country is to survive.

Mr Savona: I just want to pick up on reasonable accommodation and being able to work. I have been on social assistance all my life, and I just want to point out to

you how great it feels to wake up in the morning and know that I am going to work rather than sitting at home collecting welfare. So I think it is very important that we get reasonable accommodation.

Mr Decter: Did everyone get that? I guess that is all we have to say.

The Chair: We are beyond the time, but Mr Malkowski, we can have one brief question. I should point out that the Chair of the committee, Tony Silipo, is back in the chair.

Mr Malkowski: We have a male interpreter's voice at this point. Well, we have three interpreters, but what you are listening to now is a male interpreter's voice.

You have been emphasizing for us to consider the recognition of disabled people in the Constitution and to have that entrenched. Do you think it should be the right of disabled people to have accessible education, transportation, participation in activities and barrier-free discrimination? Do you think it would also entail any financial commitment to cover the cost for reasonable accommodation? Or do you think it should be similar to the omnibus legislation? How can you help us with the specific concepts that you would like us to incorporate into the Constitution?

Mr Southern: I am not overly familiar, Gary, with the omnibus legislation. For one thing, I do not have an awful lot of faith in it. This is just a personal point of view; there are people around PUSH who think otherwise. Anyway, I do believe in all of those things you mentioned. We should have guaranteed access to good education, housing, work, whatever, obviously. And it is going to cost money, but so what? It costs money to employ anybody. I am tired of people saying, "Oh, you know, we've got to spend \$1,300 or whatever to employ you." People go into work and sit down at the computers and never think that somebody has to buy that computer for them. There are costs of accommodating anybody in our society. There might be some added costs involved, but I think that if we were to accommodate persons with disabilities into our society, in the long run the benefits would outstrip the initial cost anyway. It would lower the numbers on social assistance.

For example, Gains-D is the social assistance most disabled people live on in this province. There are 104,000 disabled people on Gains-D. Do you not think that is criminal? Do you not think it is wrong? I get so incensed when I think of that number. For people who do not know, I was a member of SARC, which produced Transitions. I just mention that because why I got involved in that was to try and reduce that number. Unfortunately, the damned number has gone up by 24,000 since we finished the report. I am personally incensed by that. I do not care which government is in power. They have to damn well get those figures down. And those 104,000 disabled people are not all incapable of work. I do not want to put a figure on it, but I would go so far as to say that at least half of them would love to work, or maybe even more, and should be given the opportunity.

Mr Decter: I would like to add one quick thing. If people are worried about the cost of reasonable accommodation, first, in the Ontario Human Rights Code it does say

that where the financial viability of an enterprise would be threatened reasonable accommodation is not mandatory.

The other point is that if anyone has ever sat down and tried to calculate how much he would have to pay someone to make sure that when he begins a job he is not worse off than he is under social assistance with the various shelter subsidies and other subsidies involved, you realize that you are paying an enormous amount to people not to work, most of whom do want to work, and we have members in our organization who have been looking for work for 10 and 20 years.

Mr Southern: And I do think that when it comes to cost, how you can justify it if you need to—and I do not believe you do, but anyway, if you want to justify it, it is worth reminding people it does not matter what group you belong to, native people, women, visible minorities; you can all become, at any given moment in time, disabled. It is worth remembering that, so when you are helping people with disabilities, you could be helping yourself in the long run, if you want to take a greedy attitude looking at the issue.

1550

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLY OF FIRST NATIONS CHIEFS OF ONTARIO

The Chair: The next organization on our list, for the members of the committee, is being heard by our other half, so we will go to the Assembly of First Nations and Chiefs of Ontario. I invite Mr Peters to come forward. Good afternoon.

Mr Peters: Good afternoon. I guess first of all, if everybody is prepared and ready, I was going to introduce myself. My name is Gordon Peters. I am the regional chief of the first nations in Ontario. On my right is Chief Roger Jones.

We did not bring a written brief to this committee because we thought that within the bounds of what happens in these committee hearings you should be well apprised of all the briefs that we have submitted over a number of years to a variety of committees in Ontario that have talked about constitutional reform, that have talked about where we fit as the aboriginal people into the scheme of things. We have dealt with the Meech Lake committee and other things, so a lot of our documentation is here.

I guess we are simply here again to utilize this forum as another way to express to people within the province of Ontario and to the new government that is currently running the activities for the province of Ontario that, again, one of the fundamental things that we are striving to deal with is have people recognize that we are the aboriginal people of this country, that there are issues that we would like to talk about in term of our relationship and our relationship only, but that is not to say that those other issues are to be left untouched, because the fundamental discussions that we would like to talk about if you are talking about a constitutional process is the relationship that we have, as the original people of this land, to any governments that have come to occupy these territories and now make laws and impose those laws upon our citizens and in our territories and utilize our resources.

The relationship we talk about, we know and most people know that it stems from our existence, and that is the thing we have been battling. The inherent rights we have are the things that we are trying to protect, and that means our basic survival as a people is what we are trying to protect. We are trying to protect our languages, we are trying to protect our culture, we are trying to protect our way of life that we have as a people, and we will do whatever is necessary to protect that life so that we are able to survive. I guess right now the constitutional discussions that are here are one of the ways that we are going to have to utilize as a forum to deal with.

We understand very clearly that there is a constitutional trauma in this country, and I guess it is beyond the constitutional trauma, because you are dealing with people. For some reason, there does not seem to be an acknowledgement that you are dealing with people. We understand the dilemma that the average citizen has when governments come together and they talk about amending formulas and they talk about policies and they talk about economic unions and all of those other things that they talk about, but they never talk about people, because we have been left out of this process as well as the ordinary person has been left out of this process and has no say in terms of what is necessary for him to survive. I guess since 1867, when Canada became a federated state, it has been clear to us that the negotiations, for 125 years-plus, have brought us no closer as the aboriginal people to being involved in any kind of decision-making in this country.

So we come to this committee and we ask again: Are you talking about trying to find a way to incorporate the aboriginal people in decision-making or are you saying that you recognize that we, as the aboriginal people in this country, have a role to play in the decision-making? That has been unclear to us before, and we have continually asked people: Are you saying that you are trying to find a way to get us in or are we already in and we are part of the discussions?

Our experience has told us that we are not in this process. Across the country right now there are a number of committees and commissions that have been established to talk about the future of Canada. You have the Bélanger-Campeau commission in Quebec, you have the Allaire report, you have also such things as this select committee here in Ontario. You have the Lortie commission that is talking about the electoral rules of this country as well, which directly impacts upon us and what we see as our relationship in this country. None of those processes we have access to. We have the opportunity to say, "Yes, we'd like to make a report" or "We'd like to have the opportunity to express our views," and that is the extent of our participation in this country.

I guess for us the struggle has been one that has been characterized as very fast and furious in our minds. We went through the 1980s with what was called the first ministers' conference on aboriginal and treaty rights. They decided that in a five-year period somehow this relationship between ourselves and the federal and provincial governments was going to be remedied. We looked back, we saw Canada, what it went through since the late 1800s

until the early 1980s when they finally patriated the Constitution, 90-some years of struggle, of trying to determine how they were going to work together, yet they asked us to determine what that was going to be in five years and they asked us to be able to sit down and resolve this problem in five years.

It was our point of view that as long as it was continuing to be looked at as being a problem in this country, we were not going to be able to come up with a solution. So now I guess we are back at the same point.

We are asking again, how do you recognize the original title of this land, that is, aboriginal title? How does the government of Ontario deal with our aboriginal rights and our treaty rights, and how does it begin to roll back its jurisdictions in being able to have us exercise the rights of our governments to be able to exist? How can we talk about a constitutional process until some of those things become remedied so that we have an active voice?

We talk about the constitutional process, and the last time we sat at the table they said, "Okay, Assembly of First Nations, you have two people, you sit over here." But we have probably 53 distinct groups across Canada, 53 distinct nations across Canada of people, and how are they represented through two people?

You know, we talked the last time about coming back to the table, and we said, "If this is going to be a true constitutional process and decisions are made, is it the government and the Premier of Ontario who are going to recognize and represent the citizens of the province of Ontario and are we going to have first nations represent themselves as well so that there is an equal partnership in Ontario?"

The response we got in the 1980s was very clear, that the government of Ontario represents all citizens and included us as citizens of the province of Ontario and, as such, the Premier represented us. We said that was unacceptable, and today we come to these forums and we say that is still not acceptable, that we have an inherent right to represent ourselves as part of our inherent jurisdictions, as part of our inherent governments, as part of our title to our lands and to our resources.

And yes, we think that the province of Ontario does have some responsibilities, and yes, we are now talking to the NDP government about those responsibilities that we think it holds.

We acknowledge the fact that the Ontario government cannot speak to us on a nation-to-nation basis, but it can talk to us on a government-to-government basis. We acknowledge that the province of Ontario cannot deal alone with the aboriginal title to our lands, but we know it can deal with the overlying jurisdiction, which means it can deal with justice, it can deal with policing, it can deal with social programs and all of those areas where it currently occupies some field of jurisdiction. Those can be relinquished and those can be rolled back and those can be occupied and dealt with by the first nations in this country. I think that is what we are talking about when we are talking about the obligations on the part of the provincial government.

1600

But in terms of how the constitutional structure applies right now, we think and we know very clearly that our primary and fundamental responsibility is still tied to the government of Canada, and no matter how many times you tell us about the divisibility of the crown and the obligations and ability to transfer those jurisdictions to the provincial governments, we will not accept that. And some of the ideas we have seen about the five regions across the country in this new constitutional process—the Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, the western provinces and first nations territories being recognized in the constitutional process—we still have to remind people that there cannot be any transfer of any jurisdiction, of any kind of obligations on the part of the federal government, to any other regions of this country without our consent. Until we have some access to a process, how is anyone to know whether or not that is even a viable proposal on our part?

We would also like to acknowledge here today that in terms of that access we are talking about, after the crisis this summer in Kanesatake, I guess what you are calling the Oka crisis, we said very clearly to the government of Canada that the 1990s are rolling around and we need to be able to sit down and to look forward to what is going to happen so that we can prevent more crises like what took place this summer. The government of Canada basically said no to us again in this process, because the Prime Minister of this country refused to meet with us. We were saddled with the department of Indian affairs, which said to us again that it knows the problems we face and it could provide the best solution. The Prime Minister gave the four pillars, and we have said very clearly that there has been no change in our discussions with the federal government to this point in time.

The land claim process they have offered changes the policy very minimally and does not meet any of the standards that have been set out from our side. There has been very little done in social programming, but I guess the only things the public will see is that we are being exempted from some of the budgetary cuts that are going on within the federal government.

But the whole question of our relationship has no process for dialogue. The only thing that is created now because of those situations is more frustration, because people saw very clearly this past summer that they did have a voice and they did have a capacity to be able to express their own opinions and they did have another means of being able to exercise their right, as opposed to simply sitting down and talking with governments.

So we would like some of those questions answered for us as part of what happens with this committee on where the constitutional discussions go nationally. Are we in or are we out, and if we are in, what is the Ontario government prepared to do in terms of accommodating that? What is the role that is going to be played by the first nations in those constitutional dialogues that will occur?

Roger, do you have any other comments you would like to make?

Mr Jones: I am Chief Jones from Shawanaga first nation. I come from the heart of the tourist country up in Parry Sound, God's country. It is beautiful there.

I would like to say that this forum, I was not even aware of it until this morning when I did come to the chief's office, indicating that you were going to have the opportunity to speak on the reform of Canada.

As far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I think we have to be able to deal with grass-roots issues in the province of Ontario first before we can even talk about reform across the country.

Our concern is of course people and the land. I honestly feel that the investment is in the people, and I am talking about all people in the province of Ontario. We have to be able to create awareness of aboriginal issues in the general public in a proper manner so that we understand one another, from which side we sit on, and I think we have to be able to sit together in the future and be able to move ahead and along together in the future. At least, this is what we envision has to happen.

What goes along with that, of course, is everything else, all of those things that mean very much to us to exist on this planet. As native people, we believe that the Creator put us here on Turtle Island, which is North America. We do not wish to break that down, right down to just the Indian reserve that I come from; we believe that we have an investment in all of Canada and of course of North America and the rest of the world.

We truly believe that the way things are going, automation, we have to backtrack a little bit and have a look at the things we are doing to ourselves, the damage we are doing to our environment, to the water, the very water we drink and we depend on to survive. If those waters are polluted to the extent that they cannot be drunk, all life will not exist and of course reform will not mean a thing to us. We can reform all we want, but if we are not going to look after the things that we have to exist on our way of life, we might as well forget it.

It was very disheartening to hear that the federal government announced just after the war was over that with the financial budget that came through it extended another year on the environmental project it had. They had a five-year program. It is now a six-year program with the same amount of money. It is very important that these dollars are spent to fix our environment, and we are concerned about that—corporations devastating the land in the way of development of large dams, flooding of land, hydro projects where there is pollution from nuclear waste, those kinds of things. We have to be able to address those things very, very sincerely.

Of the total land in the province, 15% of that is privatized, and within that 15%, 1% is privatized to the extent of federally owned crown land, which includes Indian reserves within the province of Ontario. So you can see that the Indian lands that are owned are less than 1% in this province. The other 85% of the land that is crown-owned is being leased out to corporations that are not managing this land very well. They are damaging the land in many ways through strip logging and all of those kinds of things.

I guess really what I want to say is I want to highlight it to this committee in regard to reform that we cannot move into the future without the land base. We need those land claims that we are pushing forward to extend our boundaries within our communities so that we have the room to exist the way we wish to exist, and we have every right to do that. You know, we were given the right by our Creator to be here. He gave us our language. He gave us the land that we were going to be existing on. He gave us all of the things that we ever would need. We did not need money way back when to exist. We did not need materialistic things. And I am not saying that we go back and live in tepees. I am saying we pick up those values, the culture that we have and those traditions, and we bring them forward into the 1990s and the year 2000 so that we are able to understand one another.

1610

I would like to see the province of Ontario make room for the aboriginal people in this province, to have their voice heard throughout the province, so that we can sit down and talk about those very important issues of self-government and our inherent rights. With the Premier making the statement that he agreed about our inherent rights, we now have to get the Premier to not just talk those issues but walk those issues. When we talk anything we have to walk it in our daily life, and we expect that the Premier will do the same.

I came down to Toronto here because there was a convention down at the Westin. The NDP is having a convention there, and most certainly I wanted to be a participant of that convention, to have a voice, to speak in the convention so our voice and concern could be heard by the NDP. My understanding was that there are rules, you have rules, you have to be a party member for so long before you can speak on the floor and there are all kinds of things that you have to do. Most certainly that is where we always get penalized; because we do not pick up on how other governments operate, we are not able to truly give our voice and be heard on an equal basis.

It is more or less tokenism on how we are being heard, and Gord was saying that. Gord was saying, "Are we in or are we not in?" We think that we are in, and if we are talking about a reform of government in Canada, we are talking about a third order of government where we have powers as well as the province of Ontario and the federal government.

I do not think that we can sway from that. I do not think it is the powers which the province can give us or what the federal government can give us; I think it is the powers on which we are willing to move ahead in the future in harmony and co-exist, so that these issues are addressed once and for all.

Gordon, do you have anything?

The Chair: Thank you very much. We are beyond the time, but I will allow questions. Go ahead, Mr Beer.

Mr Beer: Just one comment perhaps to you both: I think one of the things that has struck us as we have gone around in our hearings is—I may be wrong, but I would say it has been almost unanimous; native, non-native—we

have got to deal with these issues now, that whatever came through the summer, and what we have heard as a committee, is that we have got to sit down and come to grips with the land issues, whatever is out on the table.

Perhaps in a sense in answer to the question of are you in or are we talking about how you might be, perhaps the message that has been brought to this committee is that we should make that assumption, that jump, which says that yes, you must be in and in on the terms that you have set out. But it really has struck. I am not quite sure what I was expecting, but I did not expect the kind of unanimity right across a whole broad section of people in the non-native communities who have said: "Look, we've reached a point where we have got to sit down and sort out these issues because we can't continue to go on in this way." In the long run one of the things that comes out of this summer is that somehow what happened then acted as a kind of a kickstarter for the non-native community. Now obviously actions speak louder than words, but I think it is fair to say that is the message that we have had from the people who have come before this committee.

Mr Peters: Well, I am glad you have gotten that message from people other than just the aboriginal people, because a lot of times when we say things nobody listens to the words we speak. I think it is crucial. One of the things you seek in going through this process is certainty, and there will be no certainty in this country as long as the issues of our people are not dealt with, because that will linger with you and you will undoubtedly hear from us for the rest of time, because until those issues are dealt with we certainly do not have any plans to go away. And we are not going away after that either, so we had better learn how to live together.

The Chair: I do not think we want you to, anyhow. I think I just echo what Mr Beer said in terms of that consensus that is out there. Obviously in the following stages of our work as a committee we will want to talk with you and with other native leaders about how we best ensure that that process continues. Obviously your discussions with the representatives of the government will also continue as well. Thank you very much for coming.

ASSOCIATION INTERCULTUELLE FRANCO-ONTARIENNE

M. le Président : Je voudrais maintenant inviter les représentants de l'Association interculturelle franco-ontarienne à nous adresser la parole.

M. Britini : Les membres du comité exécutif de l'Association interculturelle franco-ontarienne tiennent à remercier les membres du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération de nous avoir donné l'occasion d'exprimer le point de vue des membres des associations et des communautés ethnoculturelles franco-ontariennes sur l'avenir de la Confédération.

L'AIFO, l'acronyme de notre association, est le nouveau-né de la francophonie ontarienne. Elle est un organisme parapluie à but non lucratif. L'AIFO regroupe et représente d'une façon légitime les droits et intérêts des associations et des communautés ethnoculturelles franco-ontariennes. Nous voulons préserver notre héritage culturel

et en même temps nous intégrer et nous épanouir dans la francophonie ontarienne et de ce fait la renforcer et l'enrichir.

Si on veut résumer les objectifs de l'AIFO, on peut les catégoriser dans trois points. Je laisserai à Emna Dhahak, qui est notre secrétaire, de faire le résumé des objectifs de l'AIFO.

Mme Dhahak : Nous voulons faciliter et promouvoir l'intégration de nos communautés au sein de la société ontarienne et plus particulièrement au sein de la communauté franco-ontarienne.

Nous voulons oeuvrer pour l'acceptation et l'insertion de nos communautés respectives par la communauté franco-ontarienne et la sensibiliser au fait culturel.

Enfin, nous voulons collaborer étroitement avec la communauté et les organismes franco-ontariens dans tous les domaines d'intérêt général.

M. Britini : Ce qui fait que nous visons l'étroite collaboration entre nos membres, les organismes franco-ontariens et la communauté franco-ontarienne dans sa complexité.

L'AIFO est partie prenante de la francophonie ontarienne. Nos membres sont doublement minoritaires, c'est-à-dire appartenant aux deux catégories suivantes : d'une part, la minorité linguistique que représente la francophonie en Ontario et d'autre part, la minorité ethnique visible, dont nous sommes fiers. Nous sommes ainsi minoritaires et par la langue et par la race. Cependant, nous nous considérons alliés de la francophonie ontarienne parce que nos membres ont fait un choix, celui d'y vivre en français et en Ontario.

L'AIFO est désireuse de représenter et de refléter les opinions et les aspirations légitimes des communautés ethnoculturelles franco-ontariennes concernant leur avenir en tant que communauté à l'intérieur d'un Canada en pleine mutation.

Le comité exécutif de l'AIFO organisa le 28 février dernier un forum public où les membres des communautés ethnoculturelles franco-ontariennes discutèrent et échangèrent des idées sur leur vision de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération canadienne. Ce débat nous a permis de développer et de vous présenter une position commune et concertée qui reflète notre vision, nos besoins et nos intérêts concernant le débat constitutionnel.

Ce mémoire est le résultat de cette consultation. D'ailleurs, nous tenons à remercier le président du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, Tony Silipo, d'être venu et d'avoir participé à cette discussion et de nous avoir aussi donné son point de vue sur cette question. Au nom de toutes les participantes et de tous les participants, nous vous remercions.

1620

Les questions suivantes sont des exemples des questions dont nous avons discutées lors de ce forum. La première question : quelles sont les valeurs que nous partageons comme résidents de l'Ontario qui parlons le français ? Que pensez-vous du fait que le Canada ait deux langues officielles ? Quelles répercussions l'indépendance du Québec aura-t-elle sur nous ? Que pensez-vous du rapport qui existe entre les autochtones et les autres Canadiens ? Que pensez-vous de la diversité culturelle et ethnique qui

existe au Canada ? Quels sont les rôles du français et de l'anglais au Canada ? Et, en fin de compte, que veut l'Ontario ?

Nous croyons que les autochtones méritent plus que le traitement honteux qui leur a été infligé jusqu'à présent. Cela va sans dire qu'ils ont été victimes d'injustice et d'incompréhension. Quand on parle de deux peuples fondateurs — les Français et les Anglais — eux, les premiers habitants de cette terre, sont complètement ignorés.

D'autre part, nous sommes contents que l'Ontario ait participé au dernier Sommet de la francophonie, cependant, cette participation discrète, quoique positive et prometteuse, est loin de répondre aux aspirations de nos communautés qui tendent à voir un rôle et une participation beaucoup plus actifs de l'Ontario dans ce domaine-là. À l'ère du village global où nous vivons, nous jugeons de première importance que l'Ontario développe des liens plus étroits et privilégiés avec les pays de la francophonie qui sont nos pays d'origine. Cela aurait comme résultat de renforcer les liens entre l'Ontario et ces pays de la francophonie et de diversifier en même temps nos échanges et nos relations commerciales.

Je vous cite deux exemples d'échanges qui existent présentement qui sont en cours entre des compagnies canadiennes et ontariennes avec le Maroc, qui est mon pays d'origine, et qui sont très intéressants. Bell Canada international, qui a son siège social à Ottawa, a un projet de deux milliards de dollars au Maroc pour une période de deux ans. Ce projet a commencé il y a trois ans. Northern Telecom vient d'avoir un projet de 250 millions de dollars avec le Maroc. Nous croyons que c'est très positif et nous, la francophonie ontarienne, pouvons jouer le rôle de développer des niches pour l'Ontario dans ce marché de compétition globale.

Nous voulons que le français ait le statut de langue officielle en Ontario afin de nous permettre la pleine participation dans les sommets, les jeux culturels et sportifs et d'autres échanges avec la francophonie internationale.

Un autre point qui nous tient à cœur c'est ce qui concerne nos francophones d'origine ethnique qui n'ont pas pu se prévaloir automatiquement du droit d'être recensés comme électeurs et contribuables francophones. Ainsi plusieurs des membres de nos communautés ont été classés comme anglophones lors des élections scolaires de 1988. Nous avons eu des indications que ce problème d'énumération ne sera pas réglé pour les prochaines élections municipales de novembre prochain ; je parle des élections municipales et scolaires. Nous demandons aux ministères de l'Éducation et du Revenu de prendre les mesures nécessaires afin de corriger cette injustice le plutôt possible pour permettre aux membres de nos communautés de faire leur choix démocratique comme électeurs et contribuables lors des prochaines élections scolaires.

Nous demandons au gouvernement de l'Ontario de jouer un rôle de leadership et de médiateur dans ce débat constitutionnel. N'oublions pas que l'Ontario est la province la plus peuplée et la plus riche du Canada et, de ce fait même, nous devons jouer le rôle qui nous revient pour façonner l'avenir de ce pays.

Nous sommes bénis comme Canadiens et Canadiennes de vivre dans un pays bilingue. Nous sommes d'avis que

le fait d'avoir deux langues officielles est un aspect positif et important pour l'image de marque que le monde se fait de notre pays. Il est important que l'Ontario reconnaisse le caractère distinct du Québec et que nous travaillions d'une manière acharnée afin de l'accommoder dans notre Confédération.

Il va sans dire que la diversité culturelle offre des avantages immenses pour l'Ontario et le Canada. D'ailleurs, le gouvernement de l'Ontario reconnaît d'une façon générale que la diversité de la collectivité ontarienne constitue une source d'enrichissement culturel, social et économique pour la province et ses habitants. Le gouvernement de l'Ontario s'est engagé à poursuivre l'égalité de traitement et de chances pour toutes les Ontariennes et Ontariens et reconnaît qu'un climat social, racial et harmonieux est essentiel à la prospérité et au bien-être de la province.

Nous avons fait quelques recommandations que nous aimerions bien vous communiquer.

1. Que l'Ontario se déclare une province officiellement bilingue et qu'elle affiche sans hésitation son appui à la dualité linguistique du Canada. Cette déclaration permettra à l'Ontario de devenir membre officiel de la francophonie et nous pourrions bénéficier des avantages économiques, politiques, culturels et autres que nous ouvrira cette tribune.

2. Que l'Ontario mette sur pied des institutions de langue française gérées par et pour les Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens pour assurer le plein épanouissement de la communauté francophone.

3. Que l'Ontario prenne des mesures concrètes concernant nos communautés ethnoculturelles. Nous demandons une loi sur l'équité d'emploi et sur l'équité raciale et ethnoculturelle afin d'enrayer toutes les formes de discrimination dans notre société.

4. Que l'Ontario ne fasse pas de discrimination envers les futurs immigrants des pays francophones comme nous laisse indiquer un article qui est apparu dans le *Toronto Star* du 16 janvier dernier. Dans cet article le ministre des Affaires civiques de l'Ontario a indiqué que le gouvernement de l'Ontario veut rapatrier des pouvoirs, particulièrement un pouvoir dans le cadre de l'immigration. Nous voulons nous assurer que, si on va faire des négociations avec le fédéral, on devrait laisser la porte ouverte afin d'avoir des immigrants, afin qu'on tienne en considération le caractère linguistique pour la réception ou pour avoir des immigrants en Ontario. Nos institutions francophones ont besoin de personnel qualifié et nous croyons que nous pouvons avoir des immigrants de ces pays de la francophonie afin de continuer à maintenir l'équilibre de la société ontarienne où la communauté francophone serait toujours épanouie et existe avec tout son dynamisme et ses activités.

5. Que l'Ontario fasse des amendements à la Loi sur l'éducation afin de rectifier la définition de francophone en Ontario et d'élargir le droit à l'éducation en langue française à toutes les Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens de la province.

6. Que l'Ontario reconnaisse l'apport des peuples autochtones et prenne les mesures nécessaires pour leur donner la liberté de gérer leur présent et de contrôler leur avenir, à savoir leur autodétermination.

7. Que l'Ontario accepte la décentralisation de plus de pouvoirs du fédéral aux gouvernements provinciaux. C'est le prix qu'on devrait payer pour maintenir un Canada uni.

M. Beer : Est-ce que vous pensez qu'il y a un rôle pour une association comme la vôtre de se lier aux francophones du Québec qui sont venus d'autres pays ? On a maintenant en Ontario un assez grand nombre de Canadiens qui sont venus d'un peu partout, comme l'indique le nom de votre association, un groupe interculturel. On se pose la question des fois s'il y a des liens entre vous ici en Ontario et un autre groupe pareil au Québec, surtout pour discuter des questions constitutionnelles, l'avenir du pays et tout ça ? Est-ce que ça existe ou est-ce que vous pensez que ça peut être utile pour les discussions que nous entreprenons ?

M. Django : Oui, personnellement, nous pensons que ça peut être utile. Mais pour l'instant, pour être honnête, il n'y a pas de relations formelles entre notre association qui est toute nouvelle et la communauté francophone du Québec.

Toutefois, comme nous l'avons souligné dans l'exposé qui a été fait tout à l'heure, ça peut nous être utile dans la mesure où nous pensons que quel que soit notre épanouissement dans cette province, nous sommes et nous demeurerons toujours francophones. Ceci étant, nous n'oublions pas que les francophones du Québec sont reflétés dans ce que nous faisons quotidiennement. Il n'y a pas de rapports formels en tant que tel, mais nous pensons aussi que notre association, comme son nom l'indique, peut être utile non seulement pour l'Ontario, mais aussi le Canada dans la mesure où d'autres pays invitent l'Ontario et le Canada à cause de son multiculturalisme. Nous constituons un élément fondamental de ce multiculturalisme. Notre association, justement, nous cherchons à joindre toutes les associations, non pas individuellement, c'est-à-dire des éléments de chaque association, mais nous cherchons à rejoindre les associations en tant qu'un tout, formant un tout pour que chacun se sente à l'aise dans cet Ontario que nous avons choisi de faire et de vivre.

M. Brimini : Je pense aussi que nous croyons en la collaboration. Nous n'avons pas, pour le moment, de relations formelles avec des associations ethnoculturelles au Québec mais c'est quelque chose, si les circonstances et les moyens nous sont permis, je pense que nous devrions faire parce que nous avons démontré le fait que nous pouvons nous épanouir en Ontario au sein de la communauté franco-ontarienne et de la société d'une façon générale. Nous pouvons en effet être un lien avec des communautés francophones ethnoculturelles au Québec afin de voir c'est quoi le rôle que nous pouvons faire ensemble pour garder ce pays uni. Je crois que ce serait très important qu'on élargisse le débat et la collaboration parce que plus qu'on va communiquer, plus on va se connaître davantage et il n'y aura pas beaucoup de malentendus sur ce que nous désirons avoir comme pays dans l'avenir.

The Chair: We have two other organizations scheduled. Homes First Society? Okay, we will just take a minute to give the witness an opportunity to come forward.

Clerk of the Committee: In place of Homes First, it is the Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation.

CENTRE FOR EQUALITY RIGHTS IN ACCOMMODATION

Mr Porter: I have actually distributed submissions from two separate organizations, the Canadian Non-Profit Housing Foundation, which was slotted for this spot, and one from my own, the Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation. Bill Bosworth sends his regrets. He was unable to make it on behalf of the Canadian Non-Profit Housing Foundation, but they have made submissions in writing which I would invite you to look at, and I may have the chance to summarize it at the end of my presentation.

I am sure that by 5 o'clock on the last day of your hearings the honourable members are somewhat weary. I know you have heard many important submissions addressing the unacceptable levels of poverty, homelessness and inequality in this province among native people, Franco-Ontarians, women, people with disabilities, racial and ethnic minorities, single parents, children, youths, the elderly, the unemployed and other marginalized groups.

These are in fact the groups that CERA, my own organization, works with. We assist those who have been denied access to appropriate housing to advance human rights claims, primarily under Ontario's Human Rights Code, but also using the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and international human rights instruments. We assist over 500 such claimants each year. About half of these claimants are single parents, three quarters are women, over a third rely on social assistance and almost one fifth are people with disabilities. Many are members of racial and ethnic minorities.

I could easily use up my allotted time trying to convey to you the extent to which Ontario as a society has failed these constituencies. I would be urging you to examine the number of obstacles that are placed in their way, the various forms of discrimination and violence they face, particularly in trying to find adequate housing, and the ineffectiveness of our human rights and housing systems in addressing these barriers. However, I feel that what you need at this point in the hearings is less a recitation of the problems Ontario faces than the proposal of some possible solutions that fall within the mandate of this committee to examine Ontario's role in Confederation and the possibility of constitutional reform.

I am hoping to use our position at the end of hearings to our advantage. Although you are weary, I think you might be desperate for some way of trying to bring together so many of the disparate concerns you have heard over these several weeks. I am going to focus, then, on only one solution and hope that by emphasizing that one it sticks in your mind and you take it seriously. It is not a novel idea; it is one you have heard from many other groups which represent interests and constituencies similar to ours. It is an idea that just seems to keep being batted around and never taken very seriously. It is an idea that we tend to put into our speeches. It has a pleasant ring to it. We have even adopted it in international law but we have not put it into action.

The idea is this: that an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing and housing, is a human right and a constitutional issue. I want to try to convince you to take this idea seriously and to issue a clear recommendation

that this right be put into human rights law in Ontario, into the equality rights section of the Constitution and that it form the basis of any international economic agreements that Canada or Ontario enters into. We are urging, in short, that Ontario's major role in the upcoming constitutional discussions be that of pressing for a new constitutional and economic relationship incorporating recognized social and economic rights.

The right to an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing and housing, is what is referred to as a "social and economic right." These rights have been recognized in international human rights law, particularly in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which Canada has ratified, unlike our neighbour to the south, and which Ontario as a province has agreed to comply with.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to hold Canada and the provinces to this internationally binding agreement. Canada and Ontario will be reporting next year on what they have done to ensure that everyone in this country has an adequate standard of living and has access to adequate housing. Perhaps the United Nations committee, on hearing the evidence of Canada's non-compliance, will cite Canada for being in violation of this international human rights instrument, but still we have no way of claiming these rights within Canadian law or in provincial human rights statutes. Where rights are not claimable, they are removed from the groups which ought to be protected by them. They become, in all honesty, paternalistic platitudes.

One of the reasons that these rights have not been made claimable in law is that we tend to think of social and economic rights as at best guiding principles or worthy aims of public policy. So when the Minister of Housing states that it is public policy in this province that housing is a right, he is really saying that he would like to ensure that everyone is adequately housed if the government only had resources to do it. He would probably be worried about the idea of entrenching such a right in law because the government might then be legally obliged to instantaneously provide everyone with adequate housing, which of course it could not do.

With respect, we would suggest that claimable social and economic rights would not lead to instantaneous bankruptcy of the province or of the federal government, and, unfortunately, it would not lead to instant housing or prosperity for everyone in Canada or the province either. Such an outcome would be as unlikely as instant equality resulting from the equality guarantees in the charter. Recognizing and entrenching claimable social and economic rights, however, would lead to the gradual transformation of our society to one which assumes certain standards of equality which are presently ignored.

1640

Social and economic rights do not simply place an additional burden on the government to provide for people. They place some responsibilities on governments, but they also mainly establish parameters within which governments, corporations, individuals and all other actors must operate, just as accepted civil and political rights do. At present we assume, for example, that the government will

not decide against holding elections in order to save money or that a corporation will not prevent workers from voting or from taking time off for jury duty. These are assumptions that have been built into the way governments, corporations and individuals behave by the entrenchment in Canada of internationally recognized civil and political rights. Of course, we also have legal recourse if these rights are violated.

Entrenching social and economic rights in our human rights legislation and in the charter would simply put in place the same assumptions and legal basis for a society in which we agree that in so far as possible no one should be homeless, hungry or inadequately remunerated for work. Governments would change, policies would be altered, but any policy which resulted in people being homeless or hungry or without adequate income or security would be open to challenge. In some cases the policy challenged would relate to the inadequate allocation of resources to meet particular needs. In other cases, the issue would be regulatory. A pregnant woman, for example, evicted for landlord's own use under the Landlord and Tenant Act might challenge the inadequate protection of security of tenure in this province. A low-income community evicted by a developer with no provision made for alternative housing might make claims against a municipality or a developer to have a decision reversed.

Social and economic rights are equality rights, quite indistinguishable, except by their absence, from the equality rights which are recognized in the charter and in human rights codes. Indeed, in the absence of social and economic rights, existing equality protections become almost meaningless for those who are the most marginalized and disadvantaged in our society. As the Ottawa Council for Low-Income Support Services stated on a button it produced a few years ago, "Poverty Stops Equality/Equality Stops Poverty." All people living in poverty will tell you that poverty is a form of violence and discrimination. The problem is that it is presently a legal form of violence and discrimination and that is what must change.

Our work at CERA makes it clear to us that social and economic rights are simply equality rights that are missing from our statutes. A single mother, for example, will call CERA and say that a landlord will not rent to her because the landlord does not want to rent to people on welfare, and we can say quite simply that that is illegal under the Human Rights Code. Another will call in and say she was refused by a landlord because the landlord says that people on welfare do not make enough money and that they do not want to rent to people who make less than a certain amount of income. We can say that is probably illegal under the code, because the effect of such a policy is similar to excluding social assistance recipients in an outright fashion. We can make that argument under the code.

But we are not sure what to do when a woman calls from Ottawa and says that that municipality will not provide welfare recipients with first and last months' rent and every landlord in town is insisting on that, as is their right under the Landlord and Tenant Act. In this case, we are not sure whether it is the municipality's policy that is resulting in the exclusion of social assistance recipients from housing

or the landlord's. Then when a mother of four relying on welfare to supplement the income of her and her husband as temporary farm labourers to somewhat less than half the poverty line phones us and tells us that she is unable to find housing for her family because they can only afford \$400 a month on rent and all they can get with that is a one-bedroom apartment and no landlord will rent a one-bedroom apartment to a family of six, clearly at this point we are into the aspect of poverty itself resulting in the exclusion of people on social assistance from housing. What do we say in such a case?

Surely the government-mandated poverty in the last two cases is of the same order as the actions of landlords in the first two cases. All of these women were denied access to appropriate housing and the underlying cause of these actions was the same kinds of prejudices and attitudes that are responsible for blatant discrimination: an undervaluing of women's work, a denigration of single mothers on the basis of their source of income or their marital status. These kinds of attitudes can be reflected in blatant discrimination or in inadequate levels of social assistance. The resulting inequality is of the same order.

In fact, all of the examples I have given are true cases. In the last one, the family with four children had to give up their children to the children's aid society because they were unable to find housing and only managed to get their children back when they were lent a tent by the children's aid society in order for the family of six to live in a tent trailer. We filed a human rights claim for that family alleging that the government policies of providing inadequate levels of social assistance are in contravention of the Human Rights Code. That was two years ago and we are still waiting for a response from the Ministry of Community and Social Services. We are hoping that the present government will be supportive of this family's claim in trying to advance the notion that housing and an adequate standard of living are fundamental rights in Ontario.

However, regardless of what we can accomplish with cases like that, we can only advance so far with existing human rights and charter protections. We should not have to work so hard to prove that poverty is a form of discrimination. The inclusion of social and economic rights in the Human Rights Code and the charter would issue clear instructions to courts that inequality in all of its dimensions is open to judicial scrutiny and may be the subject of equality claims advanced by impoverished groups and individuals.

We emphasize that social and economic rights must be entrenched as equality rights. It must be made explicit that such rights are for the protection of disadvantaged groups and never to be used to the detriment of these groups. An amendment to section 15 of the charter should clarify that this is the case for existing equality protections as well.

We are asking that Ontario play a lead role in this area. First, we should set an example nationally and internationally, putting into law a provincial charter of equality rights which includes internationally recognized social and economic rights. Second, Ontario should work in the national arena to develop a social charter that would apply to all member provinces of Confederation, whatever their status.

Finally, Ontario should work internationally to press for broad recognition of social rights.

The European Community has had a social charter in place since 1961. As they move towards further reunification next year and the year after, social and economic rights have been placed high on the agenda. Constitutional and economic change is not proceeding there without full consideration of how to entrench social and economic rights as claimable rights within the law of the European Community.

In North America and in Canada, however, we have so far made no attempt to constitute economic and political relations among states and provinces around shared commitments to social and economic rights. International relations have become increasingly dominated by economic competition, slowly eroding the very concept of fundamental social rights. In the new prosperity and the new economic order, we have only seen poverty and homelessness increase. We must resist in the strongest way possible the notion that we can forge new constitutional and economic relationships in Canada without addressing social and economic rights and all other equality rights. These are not just public policy issues; they are constitutional issues at the heart of the mandate of this committee, perhaps the most fundamental of all aspects of relationships among nations and between various jurisdictions within Confederation. We urge the government of Ontario to move decisively on several fronts—provincially, nationally and internationally—to achieve claimable and effective social and economic rights as the basis for any new constitutional and economic relations within Canada.

I have appended to my submission a draft declaration of the right to adequate housing, which I believe you may have received from other organizations that have endorsed that declaration. It is also appended to the submissions from the Canadian Non-Profit Housing Foundation, along with a kind of similar declaration or itemization of what it considers the fundamental aspects of a recognized right to housing. In their submissions you will see that, from the perspective of an organization involved in providing and creating non-profit housing, they have come to the conclusion that housing must be recognized as a fundamental human right and implemented as such in the Constitution and in human rights legislation.

The Chair: Thank you for focusing as you did on some ways in which we can address these issues. We had just earlier this afternoon, in fact, come before us a group of organizations, the Daily Bread Food Bank, the Child Poverty Action Group, Bread Not Circuses and the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, which addressed for us also in this kind of same focused way some of the issues that you have addressed as well. I think it has helped us to look at how we could be addressing these social and economic concerns that affect many people in our society in a direct way.

Mr Beer: I think the Chair mentioned some of these same issues were raised earlier. It seems to me that we have not heard a lot up until recently about the whole area of social and economic rights and how we go about including them. I am glad that you raised it as well in terms of

people saying, as we do, "Well, yes, we think everybody should have adequate housing," and perhaps get kind of nervous if we are going to enshrine it somehow, because we recognize that tomorrow morning we could not meet that. I can recall a lot of discussions around social service issues where you get into that sort of thing, how you can really enshrine that kind of right in the same way that you do others, yet you have a sense, "Look, other countries are doing that, so how do we move to meet that?" I think we have seen in the examples that were given to us earlier today that there are a number of examples where that has happened.

I wanted to link that in my question just to the fact that in terms of legislation over the last number of years, we have started looking at changes to social and economic legislation, that it should include within it as well some kind of preamble or perhaps statement of principles so that when people are looking at that legislation—it is in the Child and Family Services Act, for example, and I believe next week, when the Community and Social Services minister is going to be releasing a working paper on changes to the basic social legislation, one of the things they were looking at was trying to set out principles in that legislation that could be interpreted; I mean before a court.

Clearly that is still legislation that is something that a future government can change and what you are after here is something more fundamental and basic. I would suspect that the kind of thing you would like to see is some of those rights that have been enshrined in the Constitution, but in terms of legislation that we develop around some of these issues, do you see that as being equally important? Again, there is that question of resources. I mean, you have the principles or the rights enshrined, but how do we make sure that in fact there are the resources to back up those rights?

Mr Porter: I think you raise the fundamental question about social and economic rights, because they bring within the purview of the human rights movement all sorts of aspects of public policy which have previously been outside of the legal world or the world of constitutional guarantees. I think certainly from my organization's standpoint, we are very much aware of the dangers of an overly litigious approach to public policy issues. The courts are not always the best places to have these issues decided.

So I think the kinds of things that you raise are important, that a rights-based approach to social and economic issues will not simply be reflected in a constitutional arrangement, although it certainly has to be reflected there, but it will also be reflected in the kind of legislation and the kind of public policy which we develop that addresses those kinds of issues, and I think there are certain elements to those kinds of public policies which will be recognized, a certain recognition of the voice of the people who are affected by a policy, an ability built in for them to identify their own needs and to approach these kinds of services from the standpoint of entitlement, as opposed to, for example, charity. Those kinds of reorientations to the way we approach social issues I think would be part and parcel of any recognition of an adequate standard of living and housing and these kinds of things as fundamental human rights.

Mr Beer: Just in passing, it is interesting to me that in the report *Children First* that was released before Christmas they talk about entitlements there, what are a basic list of sort of fundamental entitlements around children, and it speaks very much to issues of poverty and developing an equal playing field, and I think that is all in the same line as you are addressing.

The Chair: Okay, thank you very much, sir.

Mr Porter: Thank you very much.

The Chair: We do have one last organization scheduled for 5 o'clock. We are a little ahead of time and they have not yet arrived, as far as we know, so I think we will need to wait a few minutes to give them an opportunity to join us. Perhaps what we can do is recess briefly, and if we can get the other members of the committee in, we can maybe just gather around someplace and deal with a couple of business issues for next week while we have the time, as opposed to doing that later. If we can just recess briefly, we can come back shortly after five when our last deputant arrives.

The committee recessed at 1654.

1716

The Chair: Okay, we are back, and it seems that the presenters we were waiting for are not going to appear before us, so we will end at this point with our public hearings.

I think it is appropriate at this time to thank, first of all, all of the presenters who have come before us. We lost track of the number of people we did hear from, but I think even at rough count we certainly have heard from close to, if not over, 500 different groups and organizations and individuals, and I think that certainly bodes well for the kind of consultative process we wanted to embark upon in this first stage.

I think we will underline again, as we have done throughout the process, that this indeed is a first stage and that as we now work towards preparing our interim report over the next couple of weeks and preparing that for 21 March, we will also, as part of that, address the issue of a continuing process of discussion with the people of the province, as well as addressing in some detail some of the many issues that have been put before us.

There was certainly a wide range of views expressed, but indeed there were also a number of unifying statements that have come across, particularly with respect to issues affecting native peoples, and I think generally the understanding that is out there among the population of the province that we are at an important crossroads in our history as a country and that they want some leadership from us and from our governments, but they also want to make sure that we find ways to continue to ensure that they are also involved in these processes of discussions and decisions. In that respect we recognize that, and the process in that sense has also been quite useful in bringing those feelings out and putting them before us as legislators.

Given the extensive travelling we have done, we would be remiss if we did not recognize at this point the tremendous amount of work that has gone into this whole month of activities. I am conscious that we actually have gone

from February into March without even noticing, I suppose, but I want to thank all of the staff who have been associated with us, from the clerks' office to Hansard to the translators to the research staff to the signers to the technical crew who have made it possible for us—

Mr Malkowski: And the interpreters.

The Chair: And the interpreters, yes, who have made it possible for us to be seen and heard across the province and to all of the many, many people who have worked with us in ensuring that these hearings were able to be seen and heard across the province. And our thanks to all of the communities that have welcomed us in the various parts of the province.

If there are any other comments from members of the committee, it certainly would be appropriate to do that now. Mr Beer? No? Okay. Ms Churley.

Ms Churley: I will be happy to make a comment. I think we are all talked out here. I could not believe it when Mr Beer did not immediately jump up to take the opportunity, but I certainly would just like to reiterate your thanks.

I think I would also like to thank the clerks who helped us as we stumbled from bus to plane and made sure that we all made it to the right bus at the right time and the right plane at the right time. They have been tremendous.

It has been certainly an incredible opportunity for me to see the province, to hear from people. I feel, and I think

everybody shares this feeling, that our perspective, certainly for the newcomers, anyway, to this government, on Ontario has changed as a result of this, that there is more of an understanding of the issues that people have brought to us. It has been a unique and really special experience and I look forward to the second stage.

The Chair: Any other comments? Mr Malkowski.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you, Mr Chair. I would like to just add that I certainly have been very impressed with all of the people who have come to speak to us and all of the groups: native people, francophones, various community organizations, deaf and disabled organizations. I think it has been very important that people have had the opportunity to share with us and that we have been able to understand their various perspectives.

I also want to thank all of the members here and the clerks, interpreters, translators and so on, because they have really brought a tremendous service. I really look forward to the rest of the work that we have to do and the hope for the new Ontario and the shared vision very shortly.

The Chair: Thank you. Any other comments? All right, once again, with our thanks to everyone who has participated in this process to date and looking forward to continuing these discussions, we are adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1721.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Friday 1 March 1991

The committee, in part, met at 0919 in committee room 1.

The Vice-Chair: Good morning, everybody. Welcome back for the last day of the first part of our hearings. We are live from Toronto. So people out in the audience understand what is happening, we have again today split the committee into two parts. There is a committee up in the Amethyst Room and we are over here. Every hour, for people watching on television, we will be switching live from one committee to the other and we will be replaying in their entirety the whole proceedings probably on Monday or Tuesday.

CANADIAN ALLIANCE
IN SOLIDARITY WITH NATIVE PEOPLES

The Vice-Chair: With that, I would like to start off and call the Canadian Alliance in Solidarity with Native Peoples, if you would come forward, please.

We will be doing groups and a mix of individuals today. So that the presenters know, groups are 15 minutes, individuals are five. I will give you a bit of a warning at the end so that there is time for questions or something. We would also ask you to read your name into the record.

Mr Mason: My name is Jay Mason, president of the Canadian Alliance in Solidarity with Native Peoples. I was born in Toronto. I am Mohawk and Anishnabai. My mother is from Six Nations. My dad is from Rice Lake out near Alderville.

I would like to thank everyone for asking me here, to come and have the chance to do this. It is the first time I have been here and I have not been outside at the peace vigil or anything we had all summer, so maybe things are getting better. We are here in a different light now.

CASNP is an educational organization. Our main concern is working with native people and non-native people as an alliance in educating non-native people as to who the native people in Canada are, what are our issues are, what our stand is, what we need in terms of our struggle to be recognized as a sovereign, self-governing people and towards our land rights. So we do a lot of work in schools. We publish publications. We put out one that we have got in a lot of schools now called "All My Relations" which is a resource teaching list. Another thing we have put out is called the "Resource Reading List," which gives a critique of various textbooks and various books out there on native peoples and tells whether they are racist, whether they are stereotypical, whether they are written by native people or non-native people, whether they are objective, informative, this sort of thing. So this is the work CASNP is involved in as well as in—how would we put it?—emergency response organizing. When the situation in Quebec happened last summer, we were in a position of: What was going to be done? How are we going to make sure no one

gets hurt? So we had to be ready and able to start organizing things. This is how the peace vigil that was out here started up. There were various rallies and marches, educational campaigns, press conferences, press releases.

The direction for CASNP comes from native people. The Canadian Alliance in Solidarity with Native Peoples feels it takes direction from native peoples because they are the ones who know what their struggle is and what is needed in terms of how they go about things.

CASNP is a non-profit, charitable organization, but we do not take any government funding. The reason for that was, when CASNP first started it was known as the Indian Eskimo Association in 1960. At that time it was basically the only political lobbying arm native people had in order to work towards what they needed, their issues, whatever, and then when the other organizations started up with CASNP's help, such as the Union of Ontario Indians and the National Indian Brotherhood, CASNP decided it did not need that funding any longer because it might be competing with the native groups themselves that needed it. We have still maintained that line where we do not do that, but we try to keep on with our work. We try to fill the gaps where the other organizations cannot do something or where they cannot fit in.

Some of the things we are looking at as native people are not only the education of non-native people, who we are and what the contributions of native people are, but also educating our own people into being able to better compete with the overall society or to fit in and find our place in terms of education, business, health fields, etc. A lot of people do not realize that three quarters of the world's vegetables came from native people. We found out this summer.

A lot of people came up to us with the crisis in Oka and said, "Well, would you tell me one thing that Indian people have done for this country?" With a little bit of research you find out that three quarters of the world's vegetables came from Indian people, including the Jerusalem artichoke and the Irish potato—over 79 varieties of Irish potato. Peanuts, popcorn, chewing gum, watermelons, tomatoes, peppers and chili, all the varieties of corn, and every kind of bean in the world except horsebean and soybean came from native people. Over 300 medicines listed in a pharmacopoeia are related directly to native people. There is even evidence to show that we were instrumental in influencing the government practices and structures we live under today.

So when people ask me, "You tell me one thing that native people did for this country," I have to reflect that they have had a very serious lack in their own education. Growing up in Toronto myself—I was born here—I know in the educational system they did not teach me very much about myself.

Basically, what I remember learning was that Indians were savages, that we martyred the poor Jesuit missionaries and, oh, yes, that we gave corn and turkeys and stuff like that. That is a very serious lack in education, so we find it carries over to our own people as well. We have to educate them too to give that feeling of self-worth, that feeling of justification as to who we are, so we would start feeling better about ourselves.

We also have to deal with our native languages. As native people we look and we see there is always this question in Canada over what is the official language of Canada, so we have bilingualism, French and English. We should be saying, "Well, you all should be learning a native language," because this is native land, this is native territory. We did not bring our language from someplace else in Europe or Asia to this country and want to preserve it. Our language was here. The government issued a report a couple of years ago and said that out of 55 native languages in Canada, only three have a chance of surviving the next generation.

One of the concessions we have been able to get is that they allow us to teach native languages. We can learn the Ojibway language or the Mohawk language in schools now, but we are allowed to learn them only as a second language. We have to state that it is not our second language. This is one of the first languages of this country and there should be some attempt made for this to be recognized in the Constitution as well as French and English, that native languages as well play a viable part. You just have to look at your own words to understand that. There are a lot of native languages in there: tomato, tuxedo, toboggan, just to name three. Then there are all of our place names: Ontario, that comes from an Iroquois word, skenadadio, which means beautiful lake or nice lakes; Toronto, of course, everybody knows is an Indian word for meeting place.

We have to start looking at that because we have Brian Mulroney and he is apologizing to the Japanese, he is apologizing to the Italians, he wants to apologize to other people, but we have been faced with genocidal policies. We come to realize that boarding schools did not close down until the 1980s and we know the genocidal practices that happened there. As Indian people, we have all had our parents and our grandparents and our uncles and aunts tell us about being beaten for speaking their native language.

I call this a genocidal practice, because the Geneva Convention on genocide from 1946 says that depriving a group of its culture, heritage, religion and language is genocide, that removing children from one group of people to another is genocide, and yet we do not see anything on the part of Mulroney to apologize to us for these practices or to really help us develop a way to rectify them and start coming back into our own ways to preserve who we are as a people.

Like I said, it is not so much multiculturalism, that we brought our culture from someplace else and we want to hang on to part of it. Our culture came from here; it should also be part of the culture of Canada and it should be part of the culture of North America. So this is the respect that has to be given to it.

This is what CASNP works on as well and like I said, our direction comes from native people. What we are trying to do with CASNP now is to increase our membership in order that the non-native people can take an active role in supporting us, where we can say we are going to be supporting the party that recognizes native land rights, that recognizes native self-government, that recognizes native language rights. Hopefully we can swing some things that way towards a better understanding, a better living arrangement for native people.

I had a chance briefly to look at the pamphlet here and even the statistics that figure in here, I remember from the 1960s, really have not changed that much for us. We still have high rates of suicide, high rates of alcoholism and drug addiction, high rates of high school dropouts and a lot of it can be attributed directly to these policies that have been committed against Indian people. We have been asked why we do not try to assimilate better, and the only thing I can come up with is, how can Canada expect us to be wholesale victims of the Stockholm syndrome and want to be part of something which has excluded us right up until the 1960s and into the 1970s?

These are the things the government has to look at. How are they going to change this? How are they going to help us to change it? As native people we know what we need to develop. We just might lack the expertise and we might lack the legislation in order to enact it.

I think I have run out of wind now, if you have any questions. I do not write speeches. They asked me to bring a document. I am not very good at writing things down, but I did bring a copy of a talk I gave someplace else which deals with a lot of these things that I can leave with you.

0930

The Vice-Chair: One of the things we see as committee is that a lot of people who come before us and speak from the heart often give very good presentations, so you have no apologies to make. Are there any questions?

Mr Winner: Yes. We love to hear from delegations like you and occasionally we even have time to ask a question, so I am going to take full advantage of it. I think you make the point very well that native people in the past have lost control over their own destinies and their own lives, and that may be why we have seen endemic drug and alcohol abuse, family breakdown, violence, suicide rates that are far higher than in the non-native population.

Part of dealing with these problems is gaining a measure of control over your own lives and that would be through self-government, I guess, self-determination, settling land claims and improving the quality of your lives.

I would like you to know that over the course of our hearings across the province there has been tremendous support for native people and that may demonstrate a dramatic turnaround from the situation even a few years ago. Certainly this government, since its inception, has committed itself to settling land claims on a fair and equitable basis, improving the quality of life for natives and at the same time moving towards self-government.

The important thing is that you as a native people determine your future to a large extent, and hopefully

through mutual and co-operative arrangement we can all work towards that end.

Mr G. Wilson: I have to say you spoke not only from the heart, but from the head. It was very informative and moving. I want to ask you, though, in the course of your experience, how you can reach people. Mr Winninger mentioned the growing support for your plight, but what about people who are not that supportive? Have you ways of reaching them with your view of things?

Mr Mason: Basically by shooting off my mouth and appealing to their lack of knowledge because, like I said, what I have seen is that people's ignorance is basically out of a lack of knowledge over who we are as native people, the things we have done and how we have come to the state we are in.

One of the things that is really important to us is land rights. Land rights for native people, for us, has to be a non-negotiable conflict, which is any conflict which stands in the way of meaningful growth in life, because the very essence of who we are as a cultural group and entity as a distinct society is inherent in that use of, that relationship to and with the land. That part is very instrumental in who we are as people, so that part is non-negotiable.

The other part we have to look at is socioeconomic development, where we have to be able to start becoming self-sufficient people. I know people have asked me, "Why don't we see more Indian people, more native people with their own businesses?" And basically I have to tell them, "We've only had about 25 years to play catch-up." Opportunities did not really open up for us in terms of business and private ownership until 1965, the 1960s. So that is not very much time for us to develop that expertise and that resource bank of uncles and grandpas who know how to educate us. This is the part we are lacking and what we have to work towards more.

Mr Harnick: Sir, this may not be within your area of expertise, but one of the things that concerns me and that we have not heard a great deal about, having spoken to many native leaders, is the problem of natives living in urban centres, the difficulty that people are having, the fact that nobody is there. There are no agencies. There is no help. What should we be doing better? What would be the role of government in helping native peoples who are off reserves in urban areas?

Mr Mason: I would say there are 40,000 to 50,000 Indians living here in Toronto. I remember growing up in Toronto. Like I said, I was born here in 1952, which was before they passed Indian citizenship for us, so when I grew up here I thought we were the only Indians in the world. But we do have native centres. We do have council fire, but there has to be more funding into viable, positive programs.

Myself, like I say, my concern is education. I would like to see better educational opportunities out there. I would like to see a good native adult education program which would prepare people for their high school diploma, and that is just a start.

Once you start with that in a positive way that native people can relate to, education geared towards their culture,

then we will start seeing things pick up a little bit. We will start seeing people pick themselves up. Some of the social problems that Mr Winninger talked about, I see not so much as native social problems as symptoms of an unhappy people.

I often feel that natives who are in urban areas are forgotten, almost to the point even by other natives, in addition to governments. We are a very invisible minority here.

Mr Harnick: To governments. Quite so, a difficult problem.

Mr Mason: This is what I can see, that if we start those educational programs and develop programs that are not only going to be educational but lead to development or employment development, these will be other things that will help people feel good about themselves, even if it is just education to where they can go back home and then take a responsible position in their community. It is a lack of responsibility for our communities, for our lives, that drives people down like that. The worst thing you can do to a human being is to make him feel useless, and this is what we are trying to combat. We are trying to feel useful again.

ONTARIO FEDERATION
OF SOUTH ASIAN STUDENTS
ONTARIO COUNCIL OF SIKHS

The Vice-Chair: We would like to next call the Ontario Council of Sikhs, Gurpreet Singh Malhotra and Manohar Singh Bal.

Again, we would remind people, when they do come to present, to make sure that they give their names so that we are able to get it into our records.

Mr Malhotra: Good morning. My name is Gurpreet Singh Malhotra and I am representing the Ontario Federation of South Asian Students. At my side is Manohar Singh Bal, who is representing the Ontario Council of Sikhs. He will be helping me field questions. Hopefully we will have some time as we move through this.

I am going to read our presentation to you and hopefully, as I said, we will have some questions.

We thank you for this opportunity to be heard. We are here this morning as representatives of the Ontario Council of Sikhs and the Ontario Federation of South Asian Students. We share a great concern for the wellbeing of this fine province and for the continued growth and prosperity of this great nation.

We have watched deliberations on television over the past few days and have witnessed statements reflecting racism, sexism and narrow-mindedness of all kinds. However, among the xenophobia, we, and I am sure you, have been heartened by the positive and constructive suggestions of some of our fellow Canadians. We are here today to perhaps enlighten you to some of the problems faced by members of our society as well as to shed more light on some of the solutions.

The following are some of the values we believe are essential to the Canadian way of life.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees freedom and democracy for all in Canada. The "notwithstanding" clause was used once by Quebec and should never be used again. The rights of all individuals, no matter where one

lives, must be protected. The Supreme Court should be supreme and no province should have the right to veto or overturn its decisions.

Our national goals and standards must be universal. We are not against giving some special powers to Quebec provided those rights do not infringe on the rights of others. We are also of the opinion that if the federal government negotiates any special deals with Quebec, all the provinces should have the same right to negotiate providing they choose to do so.

0940

Meech Lake failed partially due to the federal government's use of pressure-cooker tactics to deal with important constitutional issues. The government tried to isolate the public from the most important aspect of a democracy. The scars left by the death of Meech Lake will not fade away easily, and what we need is a smooth and understanding process to rebuild. Legislative committees and the Spicer commission will help to some degree, but we will probably have to go to a second or third round of consultative meetings to earn the trust and respect of the people.

Of major concern to us is the growing rift between the people of this country and their elected officials. Specifically, institutions such as the Senate have proven their ineffectiveness and are seen as a waste of taxpayers' money. We propose that a cornerstone of the aim to revitalize the political faith of society would be a properly reformed Senate. The traditions of this institution can largely be left intact. However, we would recommend that Senate reform properly reflect the various regions of this country.

Basing our suggestion on the writings of Tom Kent of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, we believe that the Senate should be elected for terms not exceeding six to nine years and that the Senate should be based on constituencies. The division of the seats would perhaps be as follows: the Atlantic provinces would receive 25 seats, as would both Ontario and Quebec; the prairie provinces, 25 seats, and British Columbia and the northern territories another 25 seats, for a total of 125.

As one can see, this would create a balance across the country for our house of sober second thought. This is but one way that this country can move to mend the rifts that are growing from a strong sense of underrepresentation and misrepresentation.

Another barrier to creating a strong sense of national identity is the interprovincial trade barriers. We find it absurd that a nation can agree to a form of free trade with a dominant neighbour while leaving in place various forms of trade barriers between its own provinces. Ontario must lead in creating a better climate for the free and fair exchange of goods and services among provinces here in Canada.

One of the questions raised in the discussion paper is, "How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?" It is a national disgrace and hypocritical on the part of the provincial government that such an issue has been left unresolved.

Who does not know what the aboriginal people want?

We certainly have an idea. They want their rights. They want justice. They want existing land treaties to be honoured. They want to keep their culture and heritage alive. They want land claims to be settled. They want an honest and open dialogue with the provincial and federal governments. They want recognition as the first nations in the Constitution of this country. They want a real commitment and a concrete plan of action to settle all outstanding issues. But the bureaucracy created by the invading white man of years ago will not let them have anything, and they are told time and time again that the process to settle land claims is necessarily slow.

We ask, why? If this committee can be given the mandate to finish its work by a certain date, why cannot some other kind of committee or commission address all the concerns of the aboriginal people by some specific date and develop a set timetable to implement its recommendations? Almost everybody in the government will argue that this is not possible, but the real reason is that there is no political will to give justice to the first nations.

We recommend that the government of Ontario, in cooperation with the first nations, form an advisory committee and that this committee list all the outstanding grievances of the aboriginal peoples and fix a timetable to resolve all the outstanding issues.

Relevant to the issue of achieving justice for the aboriginal people is achieving justice for visible minorities.

My late father left the United Kingdom and moved his young family to this young country so that we could have a better life, a life with finer opportunities, a chance to grow with the growing and learn with the learning. Leaving my specific case aside, when one examines the experiences of new Canadians one finds many of the flaws that mar this society.

While it is understood that anglophones in Quebec rightfully feel persecuted by Quebec's unfair language laws and that francophones in the rest of Canada feel mistreated, we feel it is very necessary to point out to this committee and to the general public the injustices inflicted upon all visible minorities, which are comparatively much greater.

For example, children in the early grades of elementary school, when shown pictures of people of different racial backgrounds and asked to point out the Canadians, have often chosen exclusively white-skinned, light-haired people as those being representative of "real Canadians." This indicates the level to which racist and wholly negative stereotypes are allowed to permeate our society.

New Canadians with accredited qualifications have found themselves overlooked by employers without explanation. As is made newsworthy from time to time, many private employment agencies take it as a matter of procedure to racially define applicants and systematically deny them job opportunities. And established immigrants who marry spouses from their country of origin normally face an unexplained, bureaucratically nightmarish wait of at least 12 to 18 months for their legal spouses to receive permission to join their mates here in Canada.

While bearing these and many other difficulties, these newcomers to our country are expected to establish them-

selves, adapt to the culture shock, raise their families, pay their taxes, and bear the scorn of the vocal bigot, the inequitable government institution and the apathy of Canadians at large.

Racism and systemic discrimination are major problems facing this province and its people. Minorities are denied equal opportunities in this province. They are systematically pushed into the corner by every sector of society. How many visible minorities do you see in the power structure of this province? How many visible minorities do you see in its senior civil service? This province and in fact this country are largely run by white Anglo-Saxons and they systematically keep others out of the power structures. One will find discrimination at every level of government, including the political party structure.

How are we to address this problem of discrimination and racism?

We recommend that the provincial government set up a task force to study the problem of racism in the province. The terms of reference of the task force should be broad enough to cover all areas such as the civil service, government-appointed bodies, the Premier's Council and every other area which affects public life. Before setting up such a task force, government should make a commitment to implement the recommendations by a set timetable.

We are of the opinion that if we do not tackle this issue today, a few years down the road we will be asked by some other commission to address the intractable problem of how we achieve justice for Canada's and Ontario's minorities.

In closing, we would like to remark on the process we are a part of today. To a certain degree, Canada's and Ontario's introspective hearings and debates signal a strength of character that conveys a genuine desire to improve as a society. However, the present degree of hesitation and immobility are proving to be destructive in both an economic and emotional sense. We of the Ontario Council of Sikhs and the Ontario Federation of South Asian Students pledge to our fellow citizens of this fine province and great nation that we will do all we possibly can to make this country, our country, prosperous, strong and free.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, sir. Just to clarify one point that you made in your presentation, you alluded to the point that the "notwithstanding" clause was only utilized one time in Canada, by the province of Quebec. Just for the record, the "notwithstanding" clause was actually brought into the Constitution by the western provinces. There was a concern that the western provinces had with regard to final decisions being made in the courts. The "notwithstanding" clause has been used by other provinces, namely, Saskatchewan; it has also been used before. There was a question.

Mr Malhotra: I stand corrected. But to speak to that, it was sort of seen, I believe, as a matter of constitutional convention that it was essentially, if you will, a panic button or something that was not supposed to become part of the daily life of a provincial Legislature's activities.

The Vice-Chair: It still is not. Just so people understand, the way the "notwithstanding" clause runs is that

basically it is not part of any law in Quebec or anything at this point.

0950

Mr Winniger: Just while we are speaking of the charter, I guess you know that section 15 of the charter prohibits discrimination, as does the Ontario Human Rights Code, and the human rights codes of other provinces are comparable.

I am wondering if you have any thoughts on how the language or the content of those sections might be tightened up to address some of the problems that you have indicated a task force should be struck to deal with.

Mr Malhotra: It is fine as far as the written word would go. The difficulties occur in the implementation. It moves through several layers of bureaucracy and program development and policy analysis before it filters down to actually fixing a problem or perhaps being called upon to fix one. We think that the difficulty lies not in the actual phrasing but in the process by which the phrasing is, if you will, implemented.

No one can deny the level of racism within the province and within the municipalities, etc, and the charter still stands. It is just that the charter does not have the scope to tackle the individual problems. It is the spirit of those words which has to be truly implemented by the bureaucracy, by large corporations, by society as a whole before the problem can at least move towards eradication.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you. Are there any other questions?

Mr G. Wilson: I was wondering whether in just a short way you could say what you think are the roots of racism and how they can be eradicated.

Mr Malhotra: Well, as has been probably pointed out many times before, the root is a sense of ignorance, it is a lack of knowledge as to what is entailed by a certain culture.

An example that comes to mind is the turban issue as seen through the RCMP, the Mounties: the changing of the uniform to accommodate an article of faith. Essentially, when society took it as normal that women become part of the Mounties, the uniform was drastically changed, of course, to accommodate them, but there was no outcry to that effect. What happened with the turban issue is that there was a great outcry, there was a great amount of negative feeling that came from the western provinces as well as local populations.

I strongly believe that stems from a lack of knowledge who Sikhs are, what cultures South Asians, in general, bring, what differences they have and how they are non-threatening. But when one is not knowledgeable of them, I guess a sense of xenophobia takes over and they become worried that they are losing control or something. Essentially, the key would be enlightenment and education, something that everyone would always hope for.

The Vice-Chair: Again, for those who just joined us, we are live from Toronto this morning. The committee is, you will find out a little bit later, divided into two parts. Basically, on the hour, we will be switching live from one committee to the other. The whole proceedings will be

retelevised over the parliamentary channel Monday and Tuesday of next week.

Also, groups this morning are going to be doing 15-minute presentations, and if time allows, we will be asking committee members to participate in questions. There are some individuals whom we are about to start calling and we are asking individuals to try to limit their presentations to about five minutes. We have a lot of presenters and we would like to be able to get through all of them today if possible.

YURIY WERETELNYK

The Vice-Chair: With that, we would like to call Yuriy Weretelnky.

Mr Weretelnky: Fellow Canadians. All too often in the course of Canadian history, unity has been used both as a signal and justification for policies of intolerance, hatred, oppression and outright genocide. All too often, emotional appeals for national unity have been espoused by those who would deny, refuse, exclude, draw the line, coerce, exploit and dominate.

For over a century, the dominant social dogma which delineated the development of interethnic relations in Canada was Anglo conformity. This policy of social Darwinism assumed that the English people, culture and civilization were the repositories of all the best virtues in terms of morality, political institutions and culture. Therefore, it was to be the mission of the Canadian political and economic institutions to civilize the "great unwashed" masses entering Canada by the end of the 19th century, to make them like us.

The resulting regimentation of Canadian society was all-pervasive, and its legacy continues to this day. It manifested itself in all spheres of public life and has had long-lasting repercussions on countless individuals and groups.

Ontario, for example, found it necessary in 1912 to issue regulation 17 which severely restricted French Canadian educational rights. In the Prairies at the height of the frenzy during the First World War, Ukrainian-English bilingual schools were forcibly shut down and the use of the Ukrainian language was not even tolerated during recess, for which they were severely punished.

But perhaps nowhere were the excesses of a zealous policy of Anglo conformity more pronounced than in the case of Indian residential schools. Not only were native Canadian children subjected to all of the same outrages as their non-native and non-English counterparts, but they were also uprooted from their families, clans and communities, forcibly torn away from the sources of their spirituality, cultures and languages, all in order to satisfy the desire of the dominant Anglo-Canadian ethnic group and put into force by the federal government to "make them like us." Only now is Canadian consciousness beginning to realize the full dimension of the unimaginable horrors and incredible brutalities of the cultural genocide which our country inflicted on many of its least powerful members.

This pursuit of national unity through the policy of anglo conformity also manifested itself by depriving all sectors of Canadian society solely on the basis of national origin. In this regard, we have two notable examples: the

internment in concentration camps of thousands of Ukrainian Canadians during the First World War and of thousands of Japanese Canadians during the Second World War.

Let us now take a snapshot look at the state of unity in present-day Canada by posing several pertinent questions. What sort of unity can there be between the many native children languishing on impoverished reserves and in the process seeking escape in drugs, alcohol and tragically all too often the final solution, suicide, and the pampered kids of privileged families for whom hunger and want are only words in a dictionary? What sort of unity can there be between the feminists who strive for genuine equality for women and the moral paragons of patriarchal virtues who countenance women to maintain their traditional roles? What sort of unity can there be between those who support the use of Canadian armed forces against native Canadians and those who firmly believe that the genocidal injustices suffered by the aboriginal peoples must be addressed immediately?

Let us now begin to demythologize some of the concepts which underlie the principle of unity and which serve as undefined platitudes which are meant to be the glue that holds the society together. Is not the concept of the two founding nations one of the most pernicious of all mythologies employed to justify existing power relationships? How is it to be accepted by the 35% of Canadians who are left out in the cold, except as totally unacceptable and profoundly offensive? Is it not the very zenith of obscenity to claim there is social justice in Canada when there are families who count their assets in the billions of dollars while a single mother of three makes a futile attempt to raise her family on \$12,000 a year? Is it not the apex of cynicism and hypocrisy to claim that a worker earning \$25,000 a year and exercising his democratic right to vote roughly every four years enjoys the same social, political and economic rights as a captain of the corporate world who makes deals with top politicians and bureaucrats in the luxurious surroundings of exclusive clubs? What kind of equality of opportunity exists between the scion of a corporate elite family attending Upper Canada College and groomed since infancy to assume his rightful place in the rarified atmosphere of the penthouses of power, and the daughter of a single black mother on welfare who is forced to suffer the indignities of relying on overburdened food banks for help?

The year 1991 marks the centennial of large-scale immigration of Ukrainians to Canada. Politicians of all levels will offer the usual platitudes stressing the contributions that Ukrainians have made and how well they have integrated in the socioeconomic situation. However, the real story in Canada, which will only be heard at some university conferences, is not pretty. Those significant advances achieved by Ukrainian Canadians over the course of the past century have occurred only at terrible costs: internment in concentration camps, barbaric shutdown of their bilingual schools, public burnings of Ukrainian-language textbooks, having to change their names in order to escape the worst cases of discrimination and finally massive assimilation into Anglo-Ukrainian culture.

[Remarks in Ukrainian]

Maintenant, quelques mots en ce qui concerne le Québec et le peuple du Québec. C'est exclusivement à eux de décider leur avenir. C'est à nous de nous engager dans un débat avec eux, mais seulement comme frères et soeurs, pas comme adversaires ou même comme ennemis.

Il faut réfléchir sur une vérité très importante : indépendamment du choix définitif des Québécois, ils resteront pour nous toujours frères et soeurs, plus proches que nos cousins américains. Ceci doit être le point de départ pour tous les débats.

En même temps, on doit exiger la protection de tous les droits humains, civils, linguistiques et culturels de toutes les minorités ethnoculturelles du Québec qui se trouvent face à une politique de franco-conformité.

1000

Let us not primitivize our political culture by facile oversimplification and obfuscation of complex social realities. Mythologies surrounding fundamental principles of our society must be deconstructed through a process of complete openness, with a view towards a restructuring of the social contract on the basis of genuine social justice. There must be no sacred cows. All principles and assumptions which supposedly glue our society together must be subjected to a microscopic public analysis and in the process be demythologized.

We are faced with a vision of two Canadas. There is a choice to be made. On the one hand, there is the Canada of those who continue to rely on traditional patriarchal power to maintain their own privileged economic position, ethnic primacy and gender superiority. On the other hand, there is the Canada of those who genuinely uphold the equality and dignity of both individuals and groups and wish to bring about real opportunity for the fullest self-determination and self-realization of both individuals and groups. This Canada upholds human rights, including the full equality of women. It believes in genuine participatory democracy. It supports the legitimacy of the view that public policy must enable the cultivation and development of all Canadian languages and cultures. It upholds the right of each individual Canadian to live without hunger and abject poverty.

If Canada continues to proceed along the path of the first vision, "unity" will mean continued patriarchal domination by some males belonging mostly to one ethnic group, "social justice" will continue to be a farce, "equality of opportunity" will remain a tragicomedy and "equality of democratic rights" will continue to be nothing more than pathetic hypocrisy and cynicism.

Conversely, if we opt to painstakingly build real unity upon the recognition, understanding and respect for the principle of diversity within the overriding concept of social justice, then perhaps the 21st century, although 100 years too late, may yet belong to Canada.

[Remarks in Ukrainian]

Merci; thank you.

FIRST PEOPLE'S CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL
CENTRE IN SCARBOROUGH, NON-PROFIT INC

The Vice-Chair: We would next like to call Obert Puck.

Mr Puck: My name is Obert Puck. I am chairperson of the First People's Cultural and Recreational Centre of Scarborough, Non-Profit Inc. I am pleased to announce we have recently received word from the Ministry of Citizenship and the Ministry of Culture and Communications that we have received the outstanding achievement award for 1991 for community and cultural development for native Metis peoples in Scarborough, so the urban people are not forgotten.

At this point in time I would like to acknowledge and support the select committee presentations of Harry Laforme, Martin Drover, Vern Christmas, Jay Mason; in principle the Ontario Métis and Aboriginal Association representation regarding the precedent case of John Sparrow; and restate that enactments of sections 32 and 35 should occur without further delay, and not to forget, full implementation of the federal green plan.

It is said of aboriginal Metis people that we are symbolists, intuitionists and philosophers, yet as a dear brother reminded me, the Greeks invented nature. Levi-Strauss, a French ethnologist-anthropologist made an interesting analogy of the practice of mind of aboriginal people, comparing us to the "handyman," a sort of tan man from Glad, in the French idiom, a "bricoleur," the art of the bricoleur, bricolage. It is the ability and skill to work inventively with that which is at hand or in ready access of our minds in order to solve problems that happen to arise, devising concepts and comparisons because they satisfy cognitive constraints, creating that which is good to think with.

In a commentary to the National Research Council's acting committee on instructional technology, the post-Meech industrial state is leaking at the seams such effluent that the planet, our mother, and her children cannot find sustenance or hope. Where is the market?

Institutions may buy art but cannot yet produce art that is good for living. Art is more than decorative representational perceptions with an appraised value, shadows on the walls of institutionalized caves. There is a severe dislocation, a non-joining of nature and culture that is not art but something else.

Yes, dominant cultures want our vibrant Mide/Wakan art at the expense of our identity, our populations and our geographical locations. Will we next see proximate the peace garden in Nathan Phillips Square a monument to the Handyman No More; co-creational and curious, forms forming forms for living art?

Each of us is principled within a community of health and abundance. Each of us has the ability to interact with our cultures and dignities intact within the epigenetic landscape of our mother environment. That we in concert are able joyfully and successfully to relieve the heavy burdens we have placed upon our mother makes us full participants in the great mystery of creation.

The destiny of aboriginal-Metis peoples everywhere has been marginalized from top to bottom by imbalanced relationships conditioned by impatience and intolerance. Lives are demoralized by enforced and limited horizons. It was understood when the first treaties were enacted that they would be conscious agreements between aware participants, permitting a mutual and collective effort to uphold

the sanctity and the value of the amenities of this place we call Turtle Island, our cherished ancestral homeland, to grow in compassion and generosity by sharing openly our mutual and varied ways, benefiting all.

Architecture and design engineering are among the products of man's attempts to find solutions to problems bound by sets of constraints. Functional, material, structural, fabrication and cultural aspects all provide limits within which factors a designer-engineer must work. Ordering constraints, parameters and aspects, applying them to a coherent structure for processing and control are in themselves design. Identifying the one particular aspect of a problem which may be stressed to the exclusion of almost all others becomes the prime design parameter limiting both the solution and its system of derivation. To establish an ideal monomaterial forces extreme creativity in design-fabrication; therefore, all subsequent constraints are filtered through the ideal monomaterial.

What would you guess is the prime design parameter given the historical temperament of Canada? Compassion is what I would suggest but I will leave you for a moment with a question, what might the ideal monomaterial be? What is Canada, Ontario, Confederation?

Canada is a most sacred trust. It is now evident we must all together set a pace to fulfil the wonderment of that which awaits us with confidence and earned pride in doing the duty one was originally charged with and that sustains the generations. We are all capable of compassion. Without doubt we will know the Rainbow Trail and the Sweetgrass way.

My hint for the monomaterial is "sentience." All too often the laws that have been inaugurated have omitted the sentience of my people; time, we are sentient.

I wish to close with the words of Don Crawford, Secretary, FPCRC, his rendition of captain Darnluck Pickhard, "Make it go number 1!" That concludes my presentation. Meegwetch.

The Vice-Chair: Meegwetch.

Mr Puck: So I have left room for more people, eh?

The Vice-Chair: Very good, you kept within your time limits.

Mr Puck: If you have any questions, I will answer some.

The Vice-Chair: Unfortunately you went a little bit over.

Mr Puck: That is why I shortened my presentation.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

1010

BRUCE MACMILLAN

The Vice-Chair: Next is Bruce MacMillan.

Mr MacMillan: I appreciate the opportunity to make a representation before you this morning. My name is Bruce MacMillan and I am here representing myself, not as a representative of other groups.

I would like to compliment the commission members and staff, particularly on handling some difficult situations last evening. I see your commission and that of other pro-

vincial commissions as a bit of a catharsis. Your commissioners are functioning as psychiatrists to the patients of Canada. There are a lot of frustrated Canadians out there, left frustrated after the process of Meech Lake and their inability to have some input into that process.

My brief this morning is six pages in length. Rather than read it to you, I prefer to kind of highlight a few points within it and then leave an opportunity at the end if indeed you have any questions.

The first page of my brief deals with my credentials, and I have a varied experience. I have been able to travel far and wide across Canada. I have worked for both national and international companies and have dealt extensively with Quebec, so I think I have a reasonable understanding of the Quebec mind and Quebec problems.

I would like to draw your attention to one paragraph, the second last paragraph on that page, which is kind of the crux of my argument. As concerned Canadians, we need to open a direct dialogue with the people of Quebec, both to acknowledge how Quebec has changed in the last 30 years as well as to educate Quebecers how Canada has changed in the last 30 years.

The next couple of pages of my brief go on to talk about Canada as a nation of bitches and complainers. I cite a prominent Canadian businessman who in the early 1980s said: "When I look at Canada today, there is nothing I see that is more painful to me than the continual fighting and bitching that is going on among and between just about every group in society. One can hardly pick up a paper these days without finding one group of Canadians at the throat of another—Ottawa and the provinces, government and the business community, management and labour, teachers and school boards, doctors and health ministries. It is a continuous fight card in which it is difficult to find winners and easy to identify the loser—Canada itself." This gentleman went on to lay the responsibility for this at the foot of the Trudeau government at the time.

I believe there are certain similarities, since in 1990 and 1991 we are very much in the same situation. We are still a nation of bitches and complainers, and I draw to your attention that the author of those remarks was none other than Brian Mulroney when he was president of the Iron Ore Co of Canada.

The problem I would like to focus on this morning is twofold. First of all, Quebec does not realize that during the last 30 years, since the beginning of the Quiet Revolution, not only Quebec has changed but Canada has changed. The second point I would like to make is that we need a non-confrontational forum for dialogue about building a better Canada through a new federalism, and let me suggest some ideas and processes we might use to address these issues.

I heard last evening and have been reading in the newspaper that a lot of people have espoused the idea of constituent assemblies as a method of going about constitutional reform, and I think this forum, which takes the process of Constitution-making out of the political realm and puts it on neutral ground, is an excellent idea. I would like to see some national organization like the Conference Board of Canada, being an ideal type of organization, co-ordinate

this type of activity. I would also like to see other organizations regionally across Canada like the Fraser Institute in Vancouver, the Hudson Institute of Canada in Montreal and perhaps an eastern Canadian research institute be included in this type of assembly.

My suggestions for dialogue between Quebec and Canada: A number of people have expressed this need for dialogue, and an example of an initiative that is being taken is that of the Scarborough East Federal Liberal Association, of which I am a member. Their executive is planning to twin with a suburban riding of Montreal with a view to having two exchange weekends in May or June of this year, where we would invite families from Quebec to come and be billeted in private homes here and we would arrange for a reciprocal visit back to the province of Quebec. We think, through communicating on a direct basis, family to family, that we have a better chance of breaking down the barriers between French and English Canada.

The other idea I would like to leave with you is a festival to celebrate our heritage. Many countries like Japan and Germany have a week-long festival each year. In Germany they have Oktoberfest in the fall. In Japan it is held around the new year period of time. I think Canadians need an annual excuse to celebrate together, and I would like to propose we consider the period commencing with Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day, 24 June, to Canada Day, 1 July, as an opportunity for dialogue, fun and celebration just as we have many multicultural celebrations around this time, and I think they could be incorporated in this kind of a celebration. I believe we need to find things to unite us, not to divide us.

Just to wrap up, I would like to point out there are a couple of other pages to my brief that I ask you to read at your leisure.

I would like to conclude with a story of two Canadian figure skaters, Lloyd Eisler and Isabelle Brasseur, one from Ontario, one from Quebec. I watched them last March in Halifax at the World Figure Skating Championships going into the finals in fourth place, with three pairs of Russians ahead of them. They skated the time of their lives and elevated themselves to the silver medal and second place. I believe these two are an example of what Canadians can accomplish if we work together, putting French and English together as well as all of the other cultural nationalities we have here, I believe we need to find more opportunities to function as a team and have a little bit less bitching and a little more constructive action towards building a better Canada.

LABOUR COUNCIL OF METRO TORONTO AND YORK REGION

The Vice-Chair: We would next like to call the Metropolitan Toronto labour council, and again, we would ask you to read your name into the record, please.

Ms Torney: My name is Linda Torney. I am the president of the Labour Council of Metro Toronto and York Region. I believe you have a copy of our brief. I think I am going to try to highlight a bit as I go through, but first of all, let me tell you I do not intend to give you one single suggestion about structure, because I am a great believer in

attempting to define what the problem is before one starts to build a structure to correct it.

First of all, a little bit about who we are: The labour council has 180,000 union members in our geographic area. We come from over 400 union locals and over 40 affiliates. Our size has enabled us to run programs in labour adjustment, education, housing and social services and we have worked extensively in coalition with very many other groups within the Metro Toronto and York region area. For that reason I think we bring a reasonably broad perspective, on the basis of our membership, to these discussions.

We certainly do not intend to address all of the questions you have put forward in your discussion brief. We are going to address some that we think are particularly important to our membership and basically try to answer the first question, which is, what binds us as Canadians? We will also be speaking basically from an urban perspective because that is what we are.

As a large urban population, we think we Torontonians tend to define ourselves in comparison with other large urban centres and in particular with those in the United States. I think we have found pride in the fact that our city has been cleaner and safer than American cities. We have been proud of the diversity of our cultural heritage. We have supported heritage because we do not see ourselves as a "melting pot," which is the term often used to express US immigration policy.

We have rejected the "world-class city" phrase as applicable to Toronto, at least at this stage, not because we have no aspirations to be world class, but we want it only on our own terms, and if it means poverty, overcrowding and pollution, then it is not the kind of thing we want. If we can be a model for equality, health and adequate standards of living, then we are in favour of being a world-class city.

We have had a strong, diverse economic base and in the past this has enabled us to withstand downturns in the economy in a particular sector.

On a broader scale, I think Torontonians, like most Canadians, have prided themselves on their medical and social programs. They are not perfect, but they are based on universality and equal access, and we think these things are important to Canadians.

I think we have considered ourselves to be proud of our foreign policy, which we have seen as setting ourselves apart from our neighbours to the south. We have in fact been peacekeepers, not warmakers.

If these are common views that we in Toronto hold as Canadians, then I think the loss of confidence many people are expressing to us is quite understandable because, you see, we have seemed to define ourselves not so much by what we are but what we are not in comparison to the US. Federal government policies, rather than strengthening our sense of identity, have seriously weakened it with the level playing field concept, and we see ourselves becoming more and more like America. Economically, in Toronto we have lost 20,000 manufacturing jobs in the last year, and unlike the 1982 recession, these plants are not laying off; they are shutting down. The federal government's economic policy has included the free trade deal with the US,

the dismantling of Via Rail, CBC cuts, the GST and now embraces a free trade deal with Mexico, which will no doubt cause more plants to shut down since they will be unable to compete. Not only have these policies devastated Canadian working people; I think they have seriously undermined our national unity.

Revitalizing the economy after this recession will be an enormous task and some of our members are wondering whether it will ever happen. Toronto currently has double the number of people on social assistance of a year ago. In the last month alone, 7,600 people were added to the welfare rolls, bringing the total to 117,000. Toronto has always been seen by Ottawa as healthy compared to the rest of the country, so Toronto residents qualify for only 27 weeks of UI benefits and require 20 weeks of work to qualify. In a city where workers have experienced two, three or even four layoffs, this is devastating.

1020

Unlike many other areas of the country, we entered the recession in the middle of a housing crisis. The number of homeless has increased dramatically and there are increasing numbers of families using food banks. There is virtually no construction except for limited co-op and non-profit initiatives. I want to correct the figure you have in your brief of 75% construction trades out of work. I heard this week that for the labourers' union, 80% unemployment is now the correct figure. By the way, this was written before the federal budget—you should know that—or I might have put some more in here on this.

On the question of national unity, I think the lack of process is almost as important as the policy. Three times in the last year Canadians watched in horror while the federal government's behind-closed-doors methods shook our nation to its foundation, once during Meech, once when troops were sent against first nations people and finally when we went to war in the Gulf. I talked to many people about these issues, and regardless of the position they took on the issue itself, the lack of consultation and the secrecy surrounding the events were appalling to all concerned, regardless of how they looked at the content of the issue.

We think the political and economic conditions in which we find ourselves will make it very difficult to achieve national unity, but we do not think it is impossible. What we think it will take is a great deal of political will and the kind of thinking that puts the wellbeing of Canadian citizens at least as important as the interests of corporations.

Economically, we must give emphasis to labour adjustment and job creation, and we need to operate on a principle of full employment with adequate wages and benefits for workers. This means retraining must meet the needs of a changing economy and it must include basic skills, otherwise vast numbers of our population are going to be left on the fringes.

We have to include a strong manufacturing base and we have to have creative ideas for achieving this. We have been working very much on the potential of developing a green industry plan for Toronto's portlands. We think that is the kind of creative idea that can help us to recover after the recession, and I hope you will encourage other communities to begin developing creative ideas for retaining

and attracting their own industry. We think if we can do what we want to do with the portlands, we can truly become a world-class city in a meaningful way.

I think, in terms of all of Canada, we must address the question of regional economic disparity. It has been a question for as long as I can recall and it is time the north, western Canada and the Maritimes were able to be treated as more than the hewers of wood and drawers of water they tended to be. I myself am a westerner. I come from BC. I grew up with the question of regional economic disparity. It is always still very interesting, when I go home to BC, to hear the perception of people from Ontario who are resident in BC. Actually, probably the only thing that unites English-speaking Canadians is a general hatred of Ontario in general and Toronto in particular.

In any new model for Canada, the rights of first nations people have to be a priority. For hundreds of years, native issues have been last on every government's agenda and it is time for them to take a higher level of priority. Without settlement of native land claims and recognition of first nations' right of self-determination, I believe no true unity can be achieved.

Our policies must address the rights of minorities. We need to remain committed to a country rich in cultural heritages. I think it makes us unique, and in Toronto, with our large immigrant population, it is particularly important.

We need to strengthen our social programs and health care. We fought long and hard for these programs. It is a major feature distinguishing us from the US. We see them being eroded and their loss might well be a final blow to our unity.

Presently, Canada can best be described as the 51st state of the United States, and we believe very strongly that we must regain control of our own economic, social and foreign policy if we are to remain Canada and direct our own future.

I would like to make just a few verbal comments. We have not addressed the issue of French Canada versus English Canada in our written brief and there is a reason for that: I think within the labour movement, as within much of the population in this province, we lack a great deal of understanding about French Canadian issues. All of the discussions have gone on in a vacuum. There has been no real education process, and quite frankly we do not feel qualified to comment on French Canadian issues beyond saying that from the labour movement's perspective we have always recognized Quebec's right of self-determination. What we do not know is the form that will take.

You might be interested to know we are taking our own steps to begin to educate our membership. At our Thursday general membership meeting of this labour council we have invited Monique Simard to come from Quebec to address us on these issues. We hope it will be the beginning of our learning process. Our labour council meetings are open meetings and certainly anybody on this committee who is interested in hearing what Monique has to say would be welcome to join us for that.

The Vice-Chair: We have time for a couple of questions.

Mr Winninger: You have identified lack of process as being as important as policy in destroying national unity. Ultimately, this committee will probably have to address the issue of process as well as substance when coming to terms with our future models for Confederation. I am just wondering whether you can amplify on your concerns with lack of process more so than what is described in your paper.

Ms Torney: Okay. I think the entire discussion around Meech Lake occurred by a small group of people truly not representing their constituencies very well, behind closed doors, in secrecy, and I would say that future discussions of Canadian unity must be done in an open, visible process. I do not think anything was more damaging than the fact that most of us did not know what was happening beyond what we saw in those final 24 hours, when most of us remained glued to our television sets wondering which government in which province was going to do what, or what the federal government was going to do next. It was like watching a horror show, and there had been no discussion.

The people I spoke to did not understand how the issue of first nations sovereignty fitted in with the question of Quebec self-determination. People were asking those questions and not getting answers. I think that remains the situation today. I believe, before any steps are taken, there has to be a massive education process with Canadians. Maybe the results of what you are doing here need to be collected and put forward in a meaningful way, so at least the people of Ontario can educate themselves through what you have learned through these committee hearings. But closed-door sessions cannot happen any more.

Mr Harnick: I had all these questions in mind that I was going to try to provoke you with until you added that last little bit about where you saw Quebec. I do not mean this in any disrespectful way, but I found that the individuals representing labour who have come to talk to us have focused upon policies of the federal government much more than they have focused upon areas they might be able to help us in resolving the constitutional problems. One of the things you stated is that you found we were becoming more like Americans. Keeping that in mind, within your union or unions or labour councils, have you had discussions about what you feel Quebec should have, how that can be achieved and whether the labour council itself, as a representative of thousands in Metro, could live with the idea of giving Quebec certain rights or benefits that maybe were different from what other provinces could have?

1030

Ms Torney: Those discussions are starting now. We have not educated ourselves on this issue either. I suppose what has happened, certainly from our labour council's point of view, is that we have waited for somebody else to educate us. Where is this definitive discussion of what Quebec really wants, if I can put it that way? That has not happened, so we are starting on that process.

At this point, I could not speak for my labour council because we do not have policy on it. We have had individual

discussions around our executive board, for instance. I know all members of my executive board express a great deal of concern about the potential that Canada may split apart. This is not in our interests, we believe, and certainly most of the members of my executive board have individually expressed an ability to live with some differences. Those are not defined and I cannot say they express my membership yet because our process has not extended that far. But would we be willing to look at certain differences? Yes, we would. What they are I could not tell you yet.

Mr Harnick: You see, I was hopeful that at some stage some of the labour groups would come and tell us about the discussions they were having with their counterparts in Quebec, what the level of tolerance would be between the groups, what kinds of frictions you were having, what kind of consensus you were having. Unfortunately, and again, I do not mean this with any disrespect, the labour groups that have come before us have dominated their time federal-bashing, as opposed to looking for areas that would be helpful in a constitutional sense.

Ms Torney: I have addressed the question of where we sit in our own understanding of the issue. Even a week from now we might have been in a better position to address that specific question. But can I just say that I think even if the issue of Quebec and English Canada is solved wonderfully well to the satisfaction of all parties, the other issues must be addressed. What I was trying to focus on are the issues we do know something about. When one talks about Canadian unity, those other issues must be addressed as well or we will not have true Canadian unity.

Mr Harnick: Look, I do not disagree with that. There is one thing I could ask you on behalf of the committee, if you will permit me, Mr Chairman.

The Vice-Chair: We are running over; very quickly.

Mr Harnick: You indicated you were going to be having a meeting with your counterparts from Quebec. It would help this committee if you could provide us with some report about that meeting, about the issues that seem to be the ones we are going to have to focus on, whether there are any possible solutions or any compromise areas or areas of consensus. If that does occur, to have that information would be very important to this committee, because quite frankly, we are without that information.

Ms Torney: Yes. We would be pleased to provide it.

The Vice-Chair: One very quick question from Mr Wilson and that will be it.

Mr G. Wilson: It is a real privilege to welcome you here, Ms Torney. As what level do you stand in organized labour?

Ms Torney: President of the Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto and York Region.

Mr G. Wilson: What does that represent in the membership?

Ms Torney: It is 180,000.

Mr G. Wilson: I think it is the third or fourth largest in Canada.

Ms Torney: It is the largest labour council in Canada and the third or fourth largest central labour party, depending on how the British Columbia Federation of Labour is running in membership at any given time.

Mr G. Wilson: Right, so as you say, it is very broadly based, so you have a good idea—

Ms Torney: Yes.

Mr G. Wilson: Mr Harnick was raising the question of the federal policies in this area, and one thing I think we are taking from this is how that worsens the tensions that already exist. In other words, if you are removing social programs, people can take the view that their problems are then caused by factors other than the federal policies. I was wondering whether you have any comments about that, because this is I think indicative of the steps you take, the proactive steps, inviting somebody from Quebec. You had programs on race relations, on human relations and on sexual stereotyping.

Ms Torney: When I put this brief together—

The Vice-Chair: Can I just interrupt for one second. I would ask you to be very brief on the answer. We have gone over.

Ms Torney: Okay, I will. When I put this brief together I actually had discussions with a number of people and I was personally appalled at the level of despair, disillusionment and discouragement out there and I think that is a reality. All of these reasons I have put in my brief were suggested as reasons people were feeling that way. I think we have an uphill battle. I think we can do it but it is going to be tough.

SENIOR STUDENT STUDY GROUP,
UPPER CANADA COLLEGE

The Vice-Chair: Next, from the Upper Canada College, the senior student study group. There is a group of five or six students coming forward. One will be speaking. Take a couple of seconds to get organized.

I would ask the members of the committee, when asking questions, to try to keep them somewhat short. We ran a little bit over on that last one.

Mr James: Good morning, Vice-Chair and members of the committee. My name is Kevin James, and I am speaking to you today in behalf of the senior student study group. As a member of the senior student study group, I am pleased to introduce you to our delegation and introduce our proposal for the reconstruction and renewal of the Canadian federation. Then I would be pleased to entertain any questions you may have.

The senior student study group is a group of 10 senior history students at Upper Canada College in Toronto. We have examined the public discussion paper prepared by this committee and, along with our faculty adviser, Dr Paul W. Bennett, we have drafted a proposal aimed at resolving some of the great weaknesses we perceive in our present federation. The members of the Senior Student Study Group present with me today are David Dubins, Simon de Montfort Walker, Jonathan Foo, Poku Forson and Julian Poon.

Our model of a new federal system in Canada is based on a long-term timetable of reform that would result in radically transformed political institutions, constitutional change and a redistribution of powers on federal and provincial levels. Our proposal is based on several premises: first, that the essential compact of our nation is a compound contract. Our Constitution today recognizes the cultural duality of Canada by according primacy to the two founding nations, English and French. Our proposal is based on explicit recognition of aboriginal peoples as the third of Canada's founding nations, and acknowledges that the essential nature of Canada's social contract has today widened to include multiculturalism.

We see no conflict arising from the recognition of the dynamic quality of our country's essential contract, and we believe it must be articulated in the Constitution.

Our brief examines constitutional negotiations with the provinces and the process of constitutional reform, restructuring of political institutions on the federal level and redefining the roles of federal and provincial governments of Canada. We also propose an expanded role for the north and for aboriginal peoples in political decision-making processes. The result is what we call the Condominium model of renewed federalism.

Imagine a vision of Canada in the year 2010 in which the Canadian federation is transformed into a Condominium, a restructured federation not unlike a giant condominium structure. The central authority would manage the federation and administer external concerns while the constituent units or provinces would preside over their own distinctly different territorial entities. The vision is one of a Canadian condominium or Condominium, an ingenious restructuring of our now threatened and divided federal state.

The Condominium model of federation acknowledges the changing nature of Canadian federalism and recognizes the regional loyalties of most Canadians coexist with national loyalty. In the renewed system, the federal government would exist as a regulator of economy, as a guarantor of equalization payments and as a body to determine defence, trade, environmental and foreign policy. Aboriginal peoples would be given a definitive role in our political process, and the patronizing and paternal territorial system of government will be revamped in accordance with aboriginal demands for self-government.

The Senate would be radically restructured to provide for regional equality, direct accountability and legitimacy through a redistribution of legislative powers. We do not propose a fast process for such radical change, and set the year 2010 as a target date for the emergence of the Condominium system. The process would be long because the people will it so. They would be accorded full participation in the process of constitutional reform through a new practice of popular consultation.

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney declared that change need not be our enemy. Indeed, Canadians are ready to embrace a radical reworking of our federation, so long as full input is accorded to aboriginal and regional concerns, and the process of ratification involves a direct appeal to all Canadians.

The senior student study group of Upper Canada College concludes by offering this set of key recommendations. The intent of these recommendations would be to initiate the process of constitutional reform leading to the creation of this Candominium Canada, a restructured Canadian federation.

1040

In summary, we recommend:

First, that first ministers undertake to negotiate a redistribution of powers on federal and provincial levels, according greater legislative authority to the provinces while safeguarding the important fiscal responsibilities of our federal government;

Second, that the process of constitutional reform be amended to provide for direct popular consultation, and that greater participation be accorded to territorial governments and the first nations;

Third, that the Senate be reformed to provide for equal regional representation and the direct election of all members. A redistribution of legislative powers would also be undertaken;

Last, that territorial government be restructured according to the proposal of the Dene nation, and that native self-government be recognized as an integral feature of the new federation.

I thank you and would be happy to entertain questions at this time.

The Vice-Chair: We thank you very much and as always, the presentations made on the part of students have always been very poignant and interesting.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for a very interesting brief. The date 2010 is of interest. That seems like a very long time to have a discussion that seems to be at a very critical turn at the moment. I would like you to say a little bit about a few more things you have put in your recommendations. You said you would like to have more direct popular consultation. Would you say a bit about that.

Mr James: Certainly. We do support the terms of the Meech Lake accord as respects provincial jurisdictions and federal jurisdictions, but we believe one of the greatest difficulties with the Meech Lake accord was its perception by the people of Canada as being fashioned by a few representatives of government without a consultative process or according any sort of consultative role to the Canadian people. We think a consensual process is integral to any sort of new scheme.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you talked about any schemes for that? We are now going to make a report and it is an interim report. Have you any direction for us about how we could continue? We have been a month on the road listening, basically, to 500 different presentations. How can we continue that consultative process? Can you tell us a little bit about what you have been saying.

Mr James: Certainly this committee is a fine example of what we believe should have taken place prior to the Meech Lake constitutional accord being drafted and we would recommend that committees such as these remain. This is a select, not a standing committee, I presume. I

think it would perhaps be worth while to look at the establishment of a permanent committee.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: On constitutional matters.

Mr James: On constitutional matters.

Mr Harnick: I am very impressed with your imaginative proposal. It certainly is miles ahead of a lot of the people who came and talked about the institutional vision they had of what would happen to this country after constitutional change. The one thing you touched upon was the idea of the federal government being involved in equalization payments. I think what you were perhaps driving at is the necessity of having a federal government that maintains national standards in areas of health care, education, social programs, regional disparities, that type of thing.

Mr James: That is right. Yes.

Mr Harnick: Why do you feel that is an important element a central government should play?

Mr James: First, dealing with the question of the equalization payments, because that is a prime example of what we believe to be an essential feature of the Canadian federation and the distinguishing feature when we compare it to other nations and federations in this world, we believe there is a need for standards to be established that other provinces and provincial governments would abide by. Certainly, while we propose a delineation of powers and a redistribution of powers that would place greater emphasis on provincial governments and accord them greater power, we strongly believe as well that there is a need for a federal government, certainly in terms of equalization payments and fiscal policy and the environment and external affairs and trade, and as you mentioned, in setting standards for social programs and social policy as well.

Mr Harnick: If you had your Candominium concept, would it bother you that some of the residents of the Candominium would have different rights from perhaps others?

Mr James: That would be of concern to us and that is why we have proposed that all provinces be accorded the same powers on the same scale so we can avoid having one province granted more power or residents of one province given a bigger opportunity.

Mr Harnick: Even though some of their interests may be totally different?

Mr James: Yes. We believe that is where equalization payments come into effect. I mean, the role of equalization payments, as guaranteed in our Constitution and as prescribed in our Constitution, is to help establish a greater equality among regions, and so we also believe that is the role of the federal government in the new Candominium structure.

Mr Winner: My question just flows from Mr Harnick's question. Why would this concept, which is quite innovative, though, appeal to Quebec if all provinces would have the same powers under it? How would it offer Quebec something more than what Quebec already has?

Mr James: It would accord Quebec those powers it desires while at the same time according those powers to other provinces. Quebec is concerned with maintaining its uniqueness in the Canadian federation, and to do that

requires certain legislative powers. Other provinces require those powers as well, and I think Quebec is less concerned if those other provinces should receive powers in areas of immigration and such just so long as it has its power reserved to propose policy and legislate policy in those areas.

The Vice-Chair: A very quick question from me: It is something I am always interested in, whenever we have younger people coming forward. All of you, do you feel optimistic over the process at the end of the day that we, as peoples of this country as well as politicians, will be able to resolve this impasse?

Mr James: I will speak first and then maybe hand it over to some of the other students, but I would say yes. But on behalf of other students in the province, we would ask you please to look long term. When we sat down to draft our proposal, we were very conscious of the fact that many commissions and committees that have been struck in the past year have specific mandates to return reports and a timetable that really ends around 1992-93. We are looking long term. We are in perhaps a good position to do that and we would ask you to please set your sights on the coming century and some of the changes that could take place then as well as now.

The Vice-Chair: Can you state your names as you are speaking.

Mr Poon: Julian Poon. I am sure all of us are very optimistic that politicians will respond to the need for them to be more responsive to the wishes of the public. In this respect we see the decentralist model shown in Candominium as giving more control and more participation to Canadians, that the whole idea of a federal paternal structure that was developed in 1867 is not what Canadians need now to preserve their distinctiveness and their right to participate in the decisions of government. So I am sure politicians will realize they have to become more responsive to the wishes of the public in future and to work for a long-term plan of Canada that will work.

Mr Foo: Jonathan Foo. I believe there has to be a long-term goal and reform aimed at the long term, because if we keep going for short-term solutions, they will just slowly snowball themselves and every 10 or 15 years you have to go through the same process again, find solutions which will only last that 10 or 15 years, and go through your whole process again. This way might last a lot longer than just your short-term goals, probably for a good time.

1050

Mr Forson: I am Poku Forson. I am very much in agreement with a long-term proposal for the sole reason that we have had many short-term proposals which do not seem to be effective. Often the proposals tend to contradict each other; they tend to conflict with themselves. This long-term restructuring ensures the provinces will be given more power to conduct many of the issues we find Quebec is testy about at this moment.

This idea of a Candominium will definitely allow for the provinces in a sense to work as nations on an individual basis in order to instate this idea of a Candominium. It is a long-term goal which will require many years of planning, restructuring and input from others.

The Vice-Chair: Last but not least?

Mr Dubins: Yes. David Dubins, Mr Vice-Chair. I believe that Canada's problems are not going to be solved overnight and there are indeed many problems in Canada. Again, as my honourable colleagues have stated, obviously long term is what we need, and we need focusing on the issues. Committees such as these I would support with full force because they examine people's opinions and they take them into consideration and, as it has been stated, they listen to what people have to say. I feel that is an essential part of the process of reform.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much for your views.

CHIEF R.K. (JOE) MISKOKOMON

The Vice-Chair: We would next like to call the Union of Ontario Indians. I also ask Mrs O'Neill to sub the chair for a second.

The Acting Chair (Mrs Y. O'Neill): Joe, would you begin, please?

Mr Miskokomon: Thank you, Madam Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the committee for giving me the opportunity to be present today and present what we believe is a unique view of Constitution and nation-building.

I speak to you today as the chief of the Grand Council Anishinabek, a people whose communities in Ontario lie around the watershed of the Great Lakes. We are over 30,000 people and our ancestors were the keepers of the land when your ancestors arrived in what they thought was the New World.

We have seen your people come and grow. I need not repeat how your people have devastated this land, consuming its resources remorselessly and without thought for future generations, polluting its air and waters and earth in your haste to develop its wealth without seeing that its wealth is already all around you to be held gently and treasured for the unborn children.

In this short time your people have been here we have seen you evolve. We saw the evolution of Canada from a small colony faithful to the crowns of France and Britain, to a Dominion, to an independent and proud nation. We have seen you evolve as well from the poverty and starvation of the first settlers to a standard of living that is one of the highest in the world.

For the first two and a half centuries of our contact with your people we have often been spectators, watching your development while we kept to our own ways and laws. The first impact your people had on us was terrifying. We were struck by waves of your diseases, to which we had no immunity. The majority of our people died within two generations of your arrival. Later, epidemics killed thousands more. Tragically, they often took the children, our weakest and least immune.

Another impact you had on us was military. Our men were called upon to fight in numerous wars that were not ours but the crown's. It is fair to say that Canada would not have been here today if it had not been for our warriors. Our losses have been your gains. It is not enough to call

another impact cultural. In an effort to assimilate us into the general population, our traditional institutions were supplanted, undermined and even outlawed. Our children were often taken away and placed in schools where our languages and cultures were beaten out of them. Our hunting and fishing were declared illegal. The damage that was done cannot be fairly compensated.

We see its results in your jails, in dysfunctional families, in the dependency rather than economic self-sufficiency for most of our communities. You also took our land. What you call land claims we call land rights. Even by the standards of your laws, which were created to protect and justify your government's actions, there were great frauds and abuses which cry out for justice.

Finally, you have nearly succeeded in destroying that land in the name of development and progress. In native cultures, the people are seen as the custodians of the land rather than the owners of it. We are only borrowing this earth from the generations yet to come and it is our responsibility to keep it from harm.

We now see you facing several crises: constitutional, economic and ecological. We see these should not be considered separately. Each of them goes to the heart of who we are. We are the first to feel the impact of social, economic and especially environmental harm.

I did not come here to complain. I came here to suggest ways for Canada to proceed with healing, to find room in its house for all the people within it. We too are a distinct society. We have our own laws, land, language, religion, culture and history. We have a vision of how our future can be accomplished within one Canada and that vision might be useful for other distinct societies in this country.

I would like to put my suggestions in the context of the values that lie at the foundation of our society, values we feel should be shared by all of us.

The government of our communities has always been more than democratic, in that we make our important decisions by consensus. We hear from all of our people. No opinion or thought is too insignificant. It was not part of our culture to choose our government by voting because the nature of elections is to create division and opposition.

We realize your system of government is based on the vote, on confrontation and on opposition. It seems a quick and clear way to resolve political questions. Voting in your Legislature decides issues quickly. You are not used to seeking consensus because in your lawmaking it has never been necessary.

In nation-building, though, we suggest you step back and consider the need for consensus. If you seek the harmony that will keep the nation together, it must come from being of one mind. You might well consider our mechanisms for reaching consensus since they are native to this land and since they have worked for us for centuries.

Consensus is a gentler concept that requires unanimity. We saw the Meech Lake accord deflated because of a lack of unanimous consent. We also saw that it collapsed because it was made in haste and in private. Our elders tell us that anything good in this world takes time to develop. We suggest that decisions about the future of the nation should be made with all the care and consideration that can be

gathered, and that no government or proposal should have to face onerous deadlines or time pressures.

Consensus must also be built in the open, not behind closed doors. It is hard to estimate the damage done by the shrouded and private nature of the last constitutional talks. It is good to see that the latest ways of seeking direction, like this one, are open and public, but we would not want to see these consultations as the prelude to yet another closed-door decision session.

Consensus cannot exclude people. Neither we nor the government of the Yukon or the Northwest Territories were included in the negotiations of the Meech Lake round. Other significant parts of society also felt excluded.

Exclusion from nation-building creates resentment and distrust. Decisions made about the people's future without their presence, participation or consent will lead to bitterness in years to come. If consensus decision-making is too difficult a concept or too drastic a change to make in one step, there are preliminary stages that could be introduced to involve all Canadians in our country and our future.

An example of this is holding referendums on issues of national importance such as abortion, free trade, specific constitutional reforms, the imposition of the general stipend tax, known to the government as the goods and services tax.

Any accord that speaks of Canada as a duality of French and English people and cultures is a narrow vision of the land and of its future. We see consensus as embracing all the peoples of the land without exclusion.

Consensus in our culture is often achieved by allowing for individuality and freedom of choice within a larger framework. It now seems as if Canada will need to allow for greater freedoms for the distinct societies within Canada. This tolerance and respect is necessary if you are going to hold a nation together.

1100

In our way, we are taught that our first responsibilities are to the future generations and the natural world. The two are linked. If we harm the natural world we harm the coming people.

Protection of the environment is not included in your Constitution. We do not see those concepts. We believe they belong there first and must always be kept before the eyes and the minds of the lawmakers. Some governments in Canada are making protection of the environment a priority, such as the Northwest Territories environmental bill of rights and the even stronger one planned for Ontario. Environmental protection enhancement and the truly sustainable development that comes with it are the only issues that Canada seems to agree on. Leadership is needed in the effort to have meaningful environmental protection included in any constitutional amendment.

In the same way, we believe that lawmakers have the obligation to seek and maintain peace. We see that "peace, order and good government" has been assigned to the federal heads of power under your Constitution. While general order and good government are useful concepts, we feel peace deserves a place of its own. The place must be so prominent that it is always in the minds of the lawmakers.

Some specific issues which affect the Anishinabek and which we want you to bear in mind:

1. There must be respectful recognition in the Constitution of our place as full and legitimate partners in the development of Canada, past, present and future.

2. We have the right to govern ourselves. It is an inherent right. We had it when you first came off your ships and we have never given it up. Our rights to our own government and laws have not faded over time.

Our treaties and aboriginal rights have been protected in the existing Constitution. The commitment to resolve the issues of self-government and to clarify our place in Canada did not lead to consensus in three meetings of the first ministers. We must keep trying. There must be more meetings, but they must be accompanied by the political will to achieve that recognition in a spirit of mutual trust and respect.

Perhaps we can establish a forum in Ontario that will work to clarify the relationship between the aboriginal people and the crown, including the rights of self-government on both sides. Together, with goodwill and patience perhaps we can bring forward the right proposals.

There might be room in the present Constitution of Canada, under section 43, for amendments specific to Ontario that might serve as examples to the rest of the country. There is an opportunity for leadership by example that we share in this province and a duty to take advantage of the progress we have already made.

We are not asking for anything more than what is fair. We are asking that you recognize we have the right to make our own laws for our own people in our own territory and that these things are necessary if we are to survive as a people.

3. Only last year did the Supreme Court of Canada clarify what we have said for over a century. They said the relationship between the crown and aboriginal people is a trust-like, fiduciary one.

The government of Canada and indeed Ontario has not yet adjusted to the impact of that decision of the courts. The legislative responsibility for "Indians, and lands reserved for the Indians" has been in the federal hands since 1867. We want to make clear the federal government's responsibility and relationship to us before any adjustments take place.

We would not want to see any changes in the Constitution that would make it more difficult for the government of Canada to fulfil its existing obligations.

4. In the Meech Lake accord, there was provision for provincial governments to opt out of national shared-cost programs with compensation, providing that they pursued programs that were compatible with national objectives. We see this kind of provision as dangerous to our rights. Many shared-cost programs are specifically aimed at our communities, which we consider a recognition of federal responsibility.

If provinces are to gain the right to opt out of programs, we at least want to retain the right to choose to retain those programs in their original form for our communities.

5. The Meech Lake accord provided that any single province could prevent the creation of a new province. The Yukon and Northwest Territories are the only places in Canada with the likelihood of seeking provincial status,

and the Northwest Territories, especially, has a majority native population. Existing provinces could block these territories achieving their potential, should they choose to do so. This limits the federal role in dealing with aboriginal people.

The provision limiting the creation of new provinces should be carefully reviewed, and so must all provisions which relegate those territories to second-class status without senators or Supreme Court judges.

6. The federal-provincial discussions on fisheries are continuing without our participation. Fishing is both an aboriginal and a treaty right as well as a constitutional issue. Many of our people depend on fish for food and for their livelihood. The manner in which our rights have been ignored for decades makes it imperative that we have access to fisheries discussions and to protection in whatever arrangements emerge from those discussions.

7. While we want to take part in constitutional development and believe that we have an important contribution to make, we do not have the financial resources to do the work properly. If Ontario sees the need to have our participation, we hope Ontario will help make that possible.

8. Any constitutional reform is irrelevant if steps are not included to protect and enhance the natural ecological system in which we all live. The rights of all Canadians to have a healthy and vibrant environment should be enshrined in the Constitution.

We have said last year in a similar presentation that it is more appropriate to have our political relationship with the crown defined by political leaders rather than by the courts. We still believe this to be true. We now see that the politicians alone may not have the vision necessary for nation-building. If we have one great strength it is spirituality, and our elders have always served as our advisers and our guides. Perhaps, in your efforts to deal with the challenges that face you, you should remember the guidance of spiritual people, ours and yours, to assist the political leaders in finding the visions we need.

Madam Chairperson, one of my elders told me, "Some people seek the promised land. Other people have claimed to have seen it. We believe we live within it."

The Acting Chair: Thank you, Chief Miskokomon, for bringing truth to us. You have used up your time but there are two members who want to ask very brief questions, and I would ask you to try to answer as briefly as possible.

Mr Winniger: Chief Miskokomon, in the event Quebec elected to separate from the rest of Canada, I would like to ask you whether you foresee any impact on your aspirations towards self-government and self-determination and also the settlement of land claims either in Quebec or in the rest of the country?

Mr Miskokomon: If Quebec decides to separate, I think there are many implications that deal with the existing Constitution that aboriginal people have embraced within section 35, recognizing existing and aboriginal rights. I think there has been one court case we have fought in England, and the court case, the ruling by Lord Denning in England said that all aboriginal and treaty

rights were transferred to Canada through the British North America of 1867, through the Statute of Westminster in 1931 and finally through the Constitution Act of Canada.

During the first two acts at least Quebec has been involved. They surely recognize they have some responsibility in the transferring of those rights in terms of treaties and aboriginal rights within Quebec, and so it cannot be left on the shoulders simply of the federal government through section 91, class of subject 24, that says the federal jurisdiction is through "Indians, and lands reserved for the Indians," that there will be some means of transferring those obligations from Canada to Quebec and then in turn to aboriginal people and negotiations within a newly formed constitutional effort within Quebec.

Mr Harnick: Just as an aside, we are delighted to hear someone mention the wisdom of Lord Denning. My question really deal with the notion of the first nations insisting on the right to continue dealing with the federal government. It is something I do not really understand. Maybe you can help us.

I know there have been overtures by this province to almost take over the responsibility for native affairs. The reaction by the chiefs—and I suspect you were involved in some of these reactions—has been: "That is not what we want. The federal government is who we have always dealt with. They have a responsibility. We want to see this through dealing with them." Can you expound upon that and perhaps explain why.

1110

Mr Miskokomon: Two clear concepts, one which is called the divisibility of the crown: When Indian nations made treaties, they made them with the crown. In subsequent times, treaty has been defined within divisibilities of the crown between section 91 and 92 powers. That impact in itself has never been clearly defined within the crown itself. Does a province take on a fiduciary responsibility for the implementation of treaties? To this point in time the province has said no, that that responsibility rests within section 91, class of subject 24, of the BNA Act, which is federal responsibility. So the provinces, once they were created, took the land and held no responsibility to Indian people; one concept.

The second concept is that Indian nations made treaties with nations. The province of Ontario is not a nation and the best we can do is discuss issues in government-to-government relations. Our governments, the government of Ontario will negotiate other arrangements, but they cannot be treaty. We can only do that with a nation and that nation is Canada.

MATTHEW FURGIEULE

The Acting Chair: Perhaps I may call forward now Matthew Furgieule. Matthew, you realize you have five minutes.

Mr Furgieule: I would like to thank you for giving me the time to present my views to you this morning. There are many areas which I feel must be considered in great detail when we are looking at any aspect of constitu-

tional reform, and certainly one area is that of aboriginal rights. I feel when we consider a distinct society, the aboriginals should be the first people we consider as a distinct society. I am not saying Quebec is not distinct; I am merely stating that the aboriginals are far more distinct than Quebec is.

The French claim or the Québécois claim that they are distinct because of their languages. However, they have only one main language, and that is French. The natives have among them approximately 11 major tongues within Canada, in Ontario the predominant one being Algonquian, of course. As well, the French, the Québécois claim they are distinct because they have civil law. However, again, the natives have far more distinct methods of practising law than the Québécois do. There is a great deal of injustice which goes on to the natives. The way we are treating the natives right now would not be tolerated by the Québécois or by any other groups of people, nor should it.

I feel we should let some reserves that feel they would do better without the Indian Act opt out of the Indian Act. However, there are still those reserves which do need the Indian Act for any methods of finances or to be able to function at all, so they should be allowed to stay in the Indian Act. However, I do feel the act should be changed to give the natives as much freedom as any other group of people has that is bound by those types of laws, because it does not seem fair that they have to abide by a lot of the things which are imposed upon them.

As well, it is disgusting that a lot of the reserves do not have heating or indoor plumbing and I feel this is certainly something that every person has the right to.

I am of the view that there should be a strong federal government in Canada. I feel we do not need a decentralized government. If people want to move certain government offices from Ottawa to other parts of the country, that is fine. However, that is not taking away from the powers of the federal government; that is merely providing for jobs in other areas of the country.

I feel there are many new problems with giving new powers to the provinces. For one thing, it seems incredible that since 1982 our Constitution has worked fine and now all of a sudden everybody is saying: "There are major problems with our Constitution. It's not working. We have to change it drastically." I feel there is a problem when you give powers to the provinces, because they will look at what is good for themselves and perhaps not what is good for the nation. What may be environmentally sound for Ontario could prove to be, say, disastrous for Quebec. Perhaps we should be thinking of the words of former US President John Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

There are many problems when you take away powers from the federal government, especially when people say the government made a mistake when it gave the Supreme Court so much power. However, I feel it would be an even bigger mistake if we were to give the power of appointing the judges and suggesting who the judges would be to the provinces, because again, you could end up with a provincially biased Supreme Court which could potentially be disastrous.

The environment is perhaps the most important issue we can ever deal with. Ten years from now, regardless of whether or not Ontario has more powers or less powers or whether Canada remains a nation is not going to matter to the survival of the human race; however, what we do with the environment is of great importance. I feel that all aspects of the environment should be solely the jurisdiction of the federal government, because if you leave it up to the provinces, certain corporations can weigh the environmental laws of different provinces and decide which one is the easiest to get away with pollution in. As well, we must ensure that there are tougher laws on the environment so that we can have a clean environment. And we can clean it up, because the methods are there to clean it up; it is a question of the funding for it.

I feel an elected Senate is not a good idea. The initial purpose of the Senate was that it was to be an appointed body of sober second thought so that if governments changed and the government had poor policy, there was a body which could oversee it and veto the decisions of that government. Now, I am aware that right now in the present system there are a great deal of patronage appointments going on. That is why I feel that if we have a committee consisting of an equal number of representatives from all the officially recognized parties in the House, and if they would decide on appointments to the Senate, then you would eliminate the idea of partisan senators.

I feel the free trade agreement is something which is terrible for Canada. It is bad for our economy. It has lost a lot of jobs, it has created a recession and the US seems to be totally unwilling to accept any changes which we want. In almost every grievance we have brought up to the bicontry panel, the decisions have gone to the US and Canada has lost on almost every single occasion.

Immigration is an area in which many provinces, for example Quebec, are seeking to have a great deal of power. However, when we consider that by the year 2025 the population of Canada is going to be declining and we will be relying solely on immigration to sustain our population, I feel that this is also an area which is of such importance that it should be left to the federal government.

As well, I do not like the idea of spending powers to provinces in terms of opting out as they have in the Meech Lake accord, because for one thing it is stated that they could opt out as long as they had a system which was compatible. It did not define what "compatible" was, nor did it define who would decide what "compatible" was. I do not think they should be able to opt out. However, if we do go that route, I think there should be some body which is clearly defined to decide what "compatible" means and to ensure that compatible definitely is compatible and not something that is completely different.

Now, if there are any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them.

The Vice-Chair: We do have time for one question. Any questions from the committee? No?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: The questions have already been placed. I think that is why we have no questions. You have

had a lot of points that you have attended to, and you have made your points very clearly about each of them.

DAVID CONRAD

The Vice-Chair: We would next like to call David Conrad. We would just remind people who are watching back home that the committee this morning, like last night, is split into two parts. There are committee meetings going on in two separate parts within the Legislature. We will be alternating every hour, basically, between one committee and the other, and the whole of the proceedings will be carried on the parliamentary channel Monday and Tuesday of next week. Go ahead.

Mr Conrad: I thank the select committee for allowing me to appear here today. Canada faces a grave crisis, but we can solve this crisis by working together. There is a lot of pessimism across this nation with the threat of Quebec separatism, a recession in full bloom, a war—although now it is ended—and environmental degradation. There is much work ahead of us, but together we can find a compromise that will accommodate the aspirations of all Canadians, even Quebec and aboriginal peoples, in the Constitution.

Also, the Constitution must reflect common Canadian values. One Canadian value is generosity. If Canada is to stay united, this generosity must come through. There must be respect for other Canadians and their needs. Aboriginals, the multicultural community and disabled people need more respect by Canadian society.

1120

I will now talk about how to address these groups' concerns. Ontario, the federal government and the provinces must negotiate in good faith to solve aboriginal land claims. Self-government for our first peoples should be enshrined in the Constitution of Canada. Aboriginal people must enjoy all the social benefits that all other Canadians enjoy. The conditions of their drinking water and their living accommodations must be brought up to Canadian standards instead of the Third World conditions they currently live in.

The multicultural community must be recognized as one of the fundamental characteristics of Canada, with a right to maintain its cultural heritage. At the same time, the multicultural community should also be a part of the Canadian culture and heritage we all share. The multicultural community should be recognized in the preamble of the Constitution and perhaps in a Canadian clause, which was proposed, I think, by Manitoba in the Meech Lake process.

This clause would not give the provinces special powers, however. This clause would also recognize Quebec's distinctiveness as the only province with a francophone majority and would be used by the courts to ensure that the francophones in Quebec would not lose their culture, which many of them fear. In recognizing Quebec's distinctiveness, the Canada clause would also ensure the survival of the English culture and multicultural culture in Quebec. The Canada clause would also recognize the aboriginal people as having a distinctive culture and would ensure that steps are taken by governments to protect their rights.

In my essay on the development of the independence movement in Quebec—a copy is attached for the members to read—I suggested that both class and ideology have played a role. The importance of resistance to dependence and urges for more economic growth has played a crucial role in Quebec's distinctiveness. Culture is more than language. Culture includes both social and economic values. Thus, all in Canada can identify with many in Quebec, with their urge for independence, but I do not feel that it would be in Quebec's interests or the rest of Canada's best interests.

The Constitution should also include environmental rights: the right to breathe clean air and to drink clean water and to eat uncontaminated food.

Senate reform must include an equal Senate, but I feel a triple E Senate which is equal among the regions of Ontario, Quebec, Maritimes and the west—each of those regions should have an equal number of Senators. Perhaps each of the provinces outside of Ontario and Quebec could be given a few more, and the north as well.

Disabled rights must be respected and the rights of the disabled should be greatly recognized in the Constitution. Legislation should be passed to allow persons with disabilities to live more independent lives. Tougher laws should be passed to increase accessibility to buildings. I also believe that perhaps economic rights could be put in the Constitution, like the right to a decent standard of living.

Finally, I also believe that Ontario should be made officially bilingual. I would welcome any questions.

The Vice-Chair: We have time for one question.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: David, thank you so much for coming. You have done a lot of thinking about this. In the very beginning, you used the two words that many people have brought to us: "compromise" and "negotiate." The only real concrete spot where I saw that coming forward in a distinct way was your Senate reform proposal. I guess my first question to you is, no doubt you have discussed this with some of your friends and your fellow students. Would you be able to give us an impression of whether you think there is a political will now to really recognize the distinctiveness that you talked about and to do the things that you are mentioning regarding Senate reform and anything else you feel could be negotiated.

Mr Conrad: Well, I believe putting in a preamble would not give Quebec, or any other provinces for that matter, special power, which many people seem to be against—the rest of Canada. I think there can be a will, but English Canada must come up with its bargaining position first. I feel Quebec has been in the process of coming up with its bargaining positions in its report. From there we could work to try to find common ground. I know it will not be easy, but I think most Canadians have the will.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So you think Ontario needs to take a proactive position in this.

Mr Conrad: Yes, I do.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much.

NATIVE COUNCIL OF CANADA

The Vice-Chair: Next we would like to call the Native Council of Canada. Just as a reminder, there are 15 minutes per presentation.

Mr George: My name is Ron George. I am the hereditary chief of a nation that is waiting for a 1,000-page judgement on the Gitksan Wet'su'we'en court case in British Columbia. I am appearing today on behalf of the president of the Native Council of Canada and as a member of the council's constitutional committee. With me today is our special adviser Robert Groves and Yves Assiniwi, a consultant with the Native Council of Canada. They will be here in a few minutes.

We have tabled a formal submission which sets out in some detail what we ask this committee to recommend and support. I will not read the submission, but I will highlight it so we have some time for questions. Basically what we are here to do is ask for your help. We have received support from this Legislature over the past three years during the Meech Lake accord process. We also received support from Premier Rae. We kept in close touch with him throughout 1989 and early 1990 as our companion resolution proposal began to seriously build momentum. Now we are asking that you help to turn support into action because we are once again being excluded from participation.

We have a long history of direct participation in constitutional reform. Where our participation has been invited and accepted, success has been achieved. We were direct participants in 1980 and 1981. We got the basic framework of our rights recognized and affirmed, and a promise that we were to be the first priority for reform. From 1982 to 1987 we were direct participants in four first ministers' conferences. As a result, the Constitution was amended again in 1984. We did not get what we wanted in 1985 or 1987. We were on the verge of success, in my view, but the Meech Lake accord displaced that opportunity.

You know the results when we have not been participants at the table. We were not present in 1981 when premiers ganged up and took the whole aboriginal rights package out, along with sexual equality rights. It took a tough stand by Premier Blakeney to overturn this betrayal. We think the same sort of stand is needed now by you and by the Premier of Ontario. Of course, we were not invited to be participants in 1987. We all know the results of our exclusion.

The process of constitutional reform has begun again and it is expected that when formal talks start, events will move quickly. We have not been invited to participate or to prepare to participate. This is unacceptable. It also threatens the success of any general effort to reform Confederation. Aboriginal peoples do not have a secure process for constitutional reform. We learned that in 1987 when we were kicked out of the process and told that we might never get back in. Most people think aboriginal peoples should have a process. All 11 governments agreed to a permanent process guarantee last year, but at the end of the day aboriginal peoples have no guarantee now, and we need one.

1130

Since 1987 the weakness of our position in the process has been clear to everyone. We have been deliberately left

on the sidelines. Worse, we have been undermined and handicapped in any of our efforts to participate. The federal government terminated all constitutional discussions with aboriginal peoples in 1987. Last year our newspapers were killed off. Our political organizations get huge budget cuts every year. All are threatened with outright termination. Almost all funding for native language promotion has now been eliminated south of 60. When it comes to respecting our rights, what is the result? Not a single federal agreement has emerged to implement or respect the rights that were guaranteed in 1982; not one agreement or action in almost a decade. What would you say if the Charter of Rights had been entrenched without any federal or provincial efforts being made to bring their laws into line with it? This is what has happened to us. Rights are entrenched and then enforcement is denied.

For years we have been asked to wait until other priorities were dealt with, priorities like powers for provinces or vetoes for Quebec or fisheries or the Senate. We have waited long enough. The NCC came to Queen's Park in 1988 and again in June of last year to talk about Meech Lake. We do not want to go over the same ground today. You know that we introduced the idea of the companion resolution. Ontario endorsed three of our four proposed changes. You also know why Ottawa's version of our companion resolution was rejected by us last year. However, if your task force is to get anywhere, it will have to build on the groundwork already done over the past few years by us and by others, including parliamentary and legislative committees.

We are aboriginal peoples. Canada is our only homeland on earth. We have nowhere else to go. All we want is to enter the circle of Confederation with honour and dignity. You know that we are founding peoples. Let's say it, and let's act as if we mean it. You also know that no change to Confederation will happen unless there is specific change to meet our needs and rights. You have to develop your proposals in the context of demands for significant change coming from within Quebec. In the same way, your proposals have to reflect aboriginal demands for accommodation both within Ontario and within Canada.

Let me summarize the main aboriginal demands for you:

1. Secure access of aboriginal peoples to constitutional reform as promised in 1982.
2. Secure access to the general process of constitutional change where our rights and interests are directly affected.
3. Clear and effective recognition of aboriginal peoples as an inherent and fundamental characteristic of Canada with protection and promotion of our cultures, languages and institutions, and
4. Security for the rights of northern peoples to enter into and participate in Confederation on terms as fair and flexible as those all other former colonies and territories were given.

For us, what is fundamental to Canada and to Ontario is the need to clearly state and give constitutional force to the recognition that aboriginal peoples are a founding and permanent part of the whole. We suggest that you look at altering your own Constitution. Consult with Ontario Indian and Metis peoples directly to develop specific recognitions

and institutions. Recognize aboriginal jurisdictions. Enter into treaties with us. Modernize the Constitution of Ontario to permit representation of Indian and Metis peoples within provincial institutions, including the Legislature. At the national level, the aboriginal role in the governing of Canada must be clarified as a key component to any national reform. We support representation structures at the national level. The proposal for an aboriginal Parliament is a good place to start.

This government is on record as supporting our role in the amendment formula through both consent and process guarantees. You support the need for a general recognition of the aboriginal right of self-government. Ontario now recognizes that this right is inherent. We applaud the government for this. But recognition through policy statements is not enough. We face a major hurdle. We lack the clout to enforce compliance of our rights even when they are clearly stated in law. That is why a general recognition of the inherent basis of self-government along with the compliance mechanism is essential and must be put into place within the national Constitution.

We also ask you to take the bull by the horns and take some concrete steps to leverage action. We do not have a lot of power. Help us with empowerment. Ontario can initiate amendments and trigger the legal requirements for a first ministers' conference with aboriginal leadership. Ontario can endorse a national treaty.

To summarize, we suggest you endorse or re-endorse amendments to the Constitution to meet the four demands that aboriginal peoples have put to the country repeatedly since 1987. We also suggest you look at reforming your own Constitution to bring together more directly public and aboriginal institutions and to allow aboriginal governments to co-operate instead of competing with provincial institutions.

Finally, we ask this committee to send a strong message to the government here and in Ottawa. Urgent action is needed in the next few months. Millions of dollars are being spent by committees and unity task forces and forums, but we are excluded from any organized participation in the process or in the intergovernmental discussions that are beginning. When we are included we contribute; when we are excluded we are forced to fight.

Recommend that a clear message should be sent and soon. Make our participation a condition for Ontario's participation in constitutional talks. Begin direct talks with aboriginal peoples in the province. We are very encouraged by statements of support and the commitments of intention from Ontario. Now is the time for this verbal support to be translated into direct action.

The Vice-Chair: Just on your last point, we recognize there need to be some changes in the way things are done sometimes as far as structure and procedure is concerned, and we see the work of this committee as being the beginning of that. The first part of what we are trying to do is to get input in order to get ideas to see where we go from here. What you said at the end is something we have heard quite loudly and clearly.

Mr Winninger: Yes, on several occasions recently the issue of creating a seat or seats in provincial legislatures for native representation has arisen. I think it was in Peterborough that one chief made a presentation. The question was put to him, and he suggested that he was satisfied with the present system of representative democracy and was not seeking to create, say, affirmative action seats for natives in the legislatures. I wonder if you have any views on that position.

Mr Assiniwi: Yes, we do have views on that. You had the views of one chief of one band which is an institution of the Department of Indian Affairs. You did not have the views of all of us.

It is obvious to anybody looking at any Legislature, at the provincial legislatures in the country or at the federal system, that our views are not heard enough. It will be a lot harder to avoid hearing our views if there is representation in every Legislature and in the Canadian system. It does not mean that agreeing to send delegations of native people to the Legislature or to the House of Commons would mean we would therefore extinguish our right to have our own governing bodies and would agree to participate in the Canadian system. Far from that. But if there is going to be co-operation, if there is going to be dialogue, our voice has to be heard once in a while and since we are out of most processes, as you already know, we feel this is one way by which our voice will be heard.

Mr Winninger: That would be creating native seats for native peoples.

Mr Assiniwi: Yes.

Mr Groves: If I could just say something very quickly, if you look at the state of Maine model, it does provide an example of corporate representation in the Legislature rather than individual representation by population of aboriginal peoples. It is the tribes which are represented, not the people of the tribes.

Mr Winninger: May I just note again it is my understanding that while natives can sit in the Legislature and express their views and opinions, they cannot vote.

Mr Groves: In that case, they asked not to have the right to vote. They were offered it and rejected it.

Mr Winninger: Thank you. You would seek to have a right to vote as well as expression.

1140

Mr Groves: Once you saw the terms of the offer, I think it would be an internal discussion among aboriginal representatives whether they wanted a vote as well as a voice. It might alter the structure of Queen's Park, for example, in terms of its committee proceedings and the reference levels in bill structures, you know, first, second and third reading, depending on how you want to do it really.

Mr G. Wilson: Another presenter raised the question of how to reach decisions, and the suggestion was through consensus. I was just wondering whether that is the model you would promote, a consensus among native groups, for instance.

Mr Assiniwi: We try to achieve consensus in any way, shape or form. This is part of our culture. It is part of our decision-making process. This is the basis of our decision-making process, but sadly enough we have to live with the provincial borders. We have to live with international borders. We have to live with different types of rules.

We are stuck between Indian Act Indians and non-Indian Act Indians, Metis, within settlement lands in the Alberta system and off-settlement lands, even with the strange concept brought up by the federal government at the constitutional conference of status Inuit and non-status Inuit.

Yes, we try to reach consensus, but since we are forced to live under so many different regimes and legal systems, it is sometimes hard to reach that consensus, but as a principle, yes, this is what we try to achieve.

Mr Groves: Just before we go, there is an additional document. In the press two weeks ago, the Globe and Mail had a reference to a federal strategy regarding section 43, and I know there is a lot of technical interest on the committee's part about whether 43 could be used or a treaty could be used. Since the government of Ontario now has a copy of this leaked document, I understand, it is only fair that the committee also have it for its reference. So we are willing to provide the committee with a copy of the document.

UNITED INDIAN COUNCILS OF THE MISSISSAUGA AND CHIPPEWA NATIONS

The Vice-Chair: Next, we would like to call the United Indian Councils of the Mississauga and Chippewa Nations.

Ms Wesley-Esquimaux: Good morning, committee members and Vice-Chair. My name is Cynthia Wesley-Esquimaux. I am here representing the United Indian Councils, which is a group of nine first nations in Ontario. Chief Maurice Laforme was supposed to make a presentation, but he does not seem to have found his way here, so I will proceed through the presentation I am going to make and if he does not come in, I will also address his.

The United Indian Councils welcome the opportunity to make this presentation to Ontario. It is important for this committee to listen to the indigenous peoples in this province and hear what they have to say.

Canada is young at governing itself compared to the first nations and Canada is clearly immature constitutionally.

It is important that so many people are advocating their rights, and the job at hand is to respect those rights so that all peoples can hold their heads high and all peoples will work to strengthen Confederation.

It is interesting that Canadians express widespread support for civil rights, for women's rights, for the rights of children, for environmental rights and even for animal rights, but the inherent rights of the first nations peoples in Canada are treated hesitantly and cautiously so as to minimize their impact.

The indigenous peoples have rights in Canada that no other Canadians have. Our rights have been recognized historically. Our rights have been recognized in our treaties. Our rights have been recognized in the Constitution of Canada. Our rights have been recognized by the Supreme

Court of Canada. Our rights are recognized in international covenants to which Canada is a signatory.

But there is currently no process in Canada to articulate these rights. No government has demonstrated the political will to implement our rights or to protect our rights within Canadian Confederation. In fact, both the federal and provincial governments attack our rights vigorously in the courts in an effort to minimize them.

Under the Constitution, the federal government has a primary duty towards Indians under section 91, class of subject 24. The federal government has used this section of the Constitution to pass Indian acts which have been geared towards assimilation and which have not worked. There is tremendous potential for Canada to work towards protection of our rights through section 91, class of subject 24, but there is no political will even to consider a positive and constructive use of the Constitution.

The provincial governments have used section 91, class of subject 24, to argue that they have no responsibility for Indians on reserves. Ontario deserves some credit for being helpful over the years, although it continues to argue that it has no duty. The current government deserves credit for the admirable statements by the Premier with regard to aboriginal issues, and we look forward to the implementation of those principles.

The federal government has adopted an adversarial role towards first nations. Their approach is to minimize aboriginal rights and minimize their trust responsibility to Indians. Policy developments appear to be more in the interests of protecting the crown than protecting Indian rights.

All federal policy initiatives are geared towards delegating authority to first nations rather than recognizing first nation inherent powers. Even rights recognized under the Indian Act and upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada, such as tax exemption, are minimized through government action. The GST is an example of this.

Why? One cannot help but ask the question why.

Do the federal and provincial governments fear the indigenous peoples and our rights? And if so, why? Is it simple racism? There are so many who would say so. Is it based on ignorance? I do not see how that can be the answer. If the Supreme Court of Canada can understand the issues, then there is no reason that governments cannot as well.

Is it because governments are bankrupt of ideas that could help them address the issues in a positive and constructive manner? Again, I do not see this as the answer. The academic community, the legal profession and native leaders and professionals have developed a viable body of knowledge in the area that can be very helpful in the debate. In the end, it baffles me that governments will not deal with our rights in a positive manner.

But I do know that someone needs to break the logjam in this area. Once people see that the world is not threatened by recognition of our rights, they will follow suit. What is needed is an open, creative, honest and honourable dialogue based on the recognition of aboriginal and treaty rights and geared towards recreating opportunities for first nations to take their proper place in Canada, to contribute to society as they did in the beginning when settlers' very

lives depended on the friendship and technology of the original peoples. There is nothing to fear in recognizing and implementing first nation rights.

Ontario and Canada are land- and resource-rich. Many problems can be rectified through honourable relations that respect historical realities and work towards a more equitable sharing of lands and resources as contemplated in the original treaty relationship.

Ontario has expressed support for aboriginal rights and Ontario needs to take the lead nationally. Ontario has a historic role to fulfil in this area. The first royal proclamation treaties were signed in Ontario. The first lieutenant governors of Ontario made strong statements in support of the rights of first nations in the province. The province has long stated support for aboriginal rights and Premier Rae has advocated aboriginal rights, including the right to self-government. With Ontario's central importance to Canada and with Ontario's central role in constitutional development, Ontario can be the agent to break the logjam on indigenous rights in Canada.

In summing up, I would just like to reiterate that the need for a serious, honest dialogue is paramount. You can no longer afford to simply pay lipservice to the constitutional process. We are willing and able to come to the table to clearly address those questions that are on all Canadians' minds.

Again, we would encourage you to take on that role. Meegwetich.

There is no chief, so I am going to read this presentation for Chief Maurice Laforme of New Credit first nation, down by Brantford.

We, the United Indian Councils, are doing what we can to give definition to our rights in a modern context.

We have developed a detailed proposal on self-government and have commenced our second year of negotiations with the federal government. We have also developed a proposal as the basis for negotiations with the provincial government which we will commence this spring.

We are also very active in national efforts to have our treaties and treaty rights implemented and to have our land claims dealt with in a fair and equitable manner.

The United Indian Councils is a historic alliance of nine first nations in southern Ontario. Our confederacy is based on our historic alliance, our treaties, our culture and our language.

We are negotiating recognition of our two levels of government: a regional or tribal structure that receives its authority from the first nations, and the first nations themselves which are autonomous and the source of all governmental powers.

The United Indian Councils are seeking recognition of our historic government powers and jurisdiction through the implementation of our aboriginal and treaty rights.

We are prepared to settle for constitutional recognition or legislative recognition as an interim measure.

The United Indian Councils seek the recognition of our powers and jurisdiction as they flow from our aboriginal rights and the historic relationship we have with the crown.

We seek to negotiate the modern expression of our Indian government authorities and recognition of our jurisdiction

within co-jurisdictional agreements that apply within our traditional territories.

1150

The principles of United Indian Councils Indian government operations are based on traditional cultural norms, with the adoption of certain modern governmental practices common in North America in recognition of future co-existence.

The first nations will continue to be the cornerstone of the United Indian Councils as autonomous indigenous governments, but each first nation will have a constitution that will outline the basis of governmental authorities and practices and will be under the direct control of the first nation citizens. The first nation government will consist of a first nation council that will act as the executive arm of government.

Each first nation will have a constitution that will outline the basis of governmental authorities and practices and will be under the direct control of first nation citizens. The first nation government will consist of a first nation council that will act as the executive arm of government. Each first nation will form a first nation congress consisting of the council and representatives of established elements within the community, such as our elders, women, youth and other groups. The congress will be the legislative branch of government.

The first nation chiefs will sit in a confederacy called the United Indian Councils and will act jointly on common or regional matters. The United Indian Councils will receive its authority and mandate for the first nations and will act as an extension of the first nations.

The United Indian Councils will house an appeals tribunal, which will be the first expression of a justice system. The appeals tribunal will be the judicial branch of government. The judicial arm of government is seen as completing the circle of government and completes a closed system. The federal and provincial governments will have no authority on reserves, but will have standing before the appeals tribunal.

The implementation of United Indian Councils government will be negotiated as areas of agreement are reached in the negotiation process. Implementation will take the form of an Indian government agreement between the federal and first nation governments and eventually will include the provincial government, in the spirit of our historic relationship. The federal and provincial governments will require constitutional amendments and/or legislation to realign themselves internally in response to this agreement.

A United Indian Councils Indian government review panel consisting of equal representation from the three governments and chaired by the United Indian Councils will be established to monitor implementation of this agreement. The United Indian Councils first nations are negotiating exclusive Indian government control of all internal or domestic matters and co-jurisdictional agreements within our traditional territories. Each first nation will have the right and authority to take actions to protect our rights, powers and privileges.

The United Indian Councils have entered into negotiations pursuant to the federal policy to clarify first nation

authority and the terms of co-existence in the modern context. We are seeking recognition of our indigenous, historic powers and the terms of our co-existence and their expression in the modern context. The United Indian Councils have stated our preference for the implementation of our aboriginal treaty rights, including our right to self-determination with a modern, negotiated agreement.

The United Indian Councils are prepared to negotiate within the current process, while working internally and externally to enhance the recognition of our rights. The United Indian Councils has stated a preference for a treaty-making and a treaty clarification process and will work towards an agreement that does not betray those principles.

The Vice-Chair: Are there any questions? The only comment I would make is that through the whole procedures of the month, travelling all over the province, one of the messages that has been loud and clear is the demands that the native people are putting forward.

The other thing that should be noted is that there is a lot of support. I would say the vast majority of presenters have said to us very clearly that we need to start moving in this direction, stop just giving lipservice and start actually trying to do things. That is something we have heard quite clearly.

The last group, is l'Association des femmes d'affaires du Québec. Are they in the room? No? Then they must have gone into the other room. Very good. We stand recessed.

The committee recessed at 1155.

1209

ASSOCIATION DES FEMMES D'AFFAIRES DU QUÉBEC

The Vice-Chair: Next, we would like to call the Association des femmes d'affaires du Québec.

Dr Lancôt: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Guylaine Lancôt. I am a medical doctor and an entrepreneur. I am the founder and president of the Guylaine Lancôt Cliniques established in Montreal and Toronto. I have also founded several more in the United States.

I am here today on behalf of the Quebec Business Women's Association. The Quebec Business Women's Association is a 10-year-old private association of women entrepreneurs, executives, professionals and merchants. Founded in 1981 by my sister Henriette and myself, it has progressed in Montreal and expanded into 23 regional chapters all over the province of Quebec. Its membership averages 4,000 members.

The goal of the Quebec Business Women's Association is to help businesswomen achieve their fair place in the business world and create a platform whereby matriarchal values can bring equilibrium to the patriarchal values that have so far overwhelmingly prevailed.

I believe a better world is one of restoring and maintaining the basic laws of nature through a good balance between opposites—materialism and spirituality, economics and humanism, productivity and creativity, short-term and long-term, science and art, quantity and quality, legality and morality. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to meet with you. I came here today to talk to you directly, heart to heart. I want to let you know who we are, what our

differences mean, where our priorities stand, how we see our role in the future of Quebec and of Canada. We want you to know not only what we think, but also how we feel about the Canadian Constitution.

Who are we? We are human beings like you. Like you we are born, we live and die. Like you we work hard, do our best, fight for survival. Like you we have children, care for them, love them, raise them and give them the best. Like you we laugh and cry, hope and despair, love and hate. Like you we are very concerned with our future, the future of our children, the future of our country, the future of our planet.

If we are so much alike, in what do we differ? What do we Quebecers mean when we say we are different? A difference in language? Yes. A difference in culture? Yes. A difference in traditions? Yes. But are those elements cause for divorce? Do you really believe those differences are major enough for Quebec to resort to separation? Good common sense tells us it is not so. What is the real reason then? What difference can be so major that it is irreconcilable? It is a difference in perspectives, a difference in aspirations, a difference in priorities.

What do we think? You say about us that we have *joie de vivre*. It is true. We are more artistic than scientific, more emotional than rational, more yin than yang.

We recognize the efforts that have been made to try to give what we want. But from our perspective we wanted autonomy, we got dependence; we wanted participation, we got domination; we wanted responsibility, we got hierarchy; we wanted openness, we got secrecy; we wanted democracy, we got bureaucracy.

When you ask, "What does Quebec want?" we answer, "The freedom to be different and the means to live our differences."

Now let me tell you how we feel. Unfortunately, words cannot translate feelings. The body cannot speak for the soul. In order to share emotions with you, we chose to use the means of an analogy.

We feel as if we are with you on a big ship. It is a beautiful, comfortable ship. We feel secure on it. We are proud of it. We are highly respected on the ocean. But there is a problem. The ship is no longer following the direction we had all chosen. We keep shouting: "Stop going in this direction or we will hit the rocks. Change direction or we will sink." But nobody listens any more and we believe that every day we are getting closer and closer to the rocks. So we Quebecers want to get off the ship, jump into a lifeboat and go our own way.

We know life would be much harder on a lifeboat. We would face the big waves, the cold, the rain, the hunger. We would have to tighten our belts, and we may still hit the rocks. But we could decide on the direction and be in control of our destiny. We do not mind the physical pain. We will cope with that because our minds will be at peace. It is not our body that is suffering on the ship. It is our soul that is in pain.

What does this analogy mean? The ship is Canada. It represents the body of the country. The direction is the vision, the philosophy of the country. It represents the soul of the country. The direction we have all chosen is one of

democracy and liberty, but we believe the direction the ship is going in now is one of bureaucracy and control. We feel we have no say in decisions that are made in our name against our will, namely, on the increasing debt, nuclear trials, control over the media, secrecy of foreign policy.

Let me give you an example: A survey that was run in mid-January 1991, when the war was declared, showed that 54% of Canadians, 70% of Quebecers, 91% of Quebec women were against Canada's implication in the war. Despite our country's long-standing reputation for peace, we kill people, destroy countries and spend \$1 billion doing it.

The rocks are the future of the country. The rocks we see ourselves heading towards are, in the extreme, nuclear war with possible eradication of all humans and all life; irrevocable pollution of the planet with extinction of our species; totalitarianism, a super world dictatorship known as a new world order.

As you can see, we are all in the same ship with the same goals and the same fears. You want to stay in the ship and hope for the best. We want to leave the ship, get into a lifeboat and go in a different direction. There are no right or wrong decisions; there are only different perspectives.

In conclusion, Quebec's attitude is not a malicious one. We simply believe at this point in time that there are things we need to accomplish that we cannot accomplish under the present structure.

We are all human beings looking for a better way to live. Let's not fight one another. We are not each other's enemy. Let's identify the real problems. Let's respect each other's decisions. Helping one another succeed with our respective choices can only benefit everybody. This is the key to a successful future for Canada.

This may have been a somewhat personal and emotional presentation, and I will not apologize for that, as it is representative of the mood of Quebec.

1220

The Vice-Chair: May I say that no apology is necessary. The presentation you made, I think, spoke very clearly of what the issue is, and may I say on behalf of the committee, thank you for a very factual and very honest presentation on how you see things. There are a number of questions. We will start with Mr Wilson.

Mr G. Wilson: I must say that I was astonished by this presentation because when I saw that you were a business association, I was not prepared for these values that you list: "autonomy, participation, responsibility, openness, democracy" are not ones that I had come to associate with business interests, especially they as are represented by our national government, which again, in highlighting the survey, are I think completely contrary to those values that our national government represents, which as I say is associated in a lot of our minds at least with big business attitude. So, as I say, I was surprised by the slant that you took but I found it fascinating, and I hope this is representative of a lot of feelings of the people of Quebec because I can say it represents the feelings of a lot of people living outside Quebec.

My question then comes to be associated with your metaphor, and I know comparisons cannot include everything, but you seem to suggest that the rest of Canada is agreed on the direction the ship is going. It seems to me that is not the case, that there is a lot of debate, and certainly we have heard it in this committee, about where this ship should be going. Is there no possibility of the people for whom you speak influencing the direction of the ship by staying on the ship rather than going in a lifeboat on their own?

Dr Lanctôt: What I have said is that all Canadians, I think, want to go in one direction but this is not where the country is going. That is why I said we are all alike; we are no different. We all got on this boat for the same reasons and the same aspirations. The difference is that Quebec says, "The boat is not going in the right direction." So Canadians say, but the difference is that Quebec says: "It does not change direction so we do not want to go on any more. We just do not want to hit those rocks, because this is where we are heading."

Mr G. Wilson: But you do not see any people in the rest of Canada who share your aspirations.

Dr Lanctôt: Absolutely. The west wants to go, everybody wants to go, but they do not go.

Why does Quebec want to leave? It wants to leave for the same reasons that other Canadians want to leave. We are not the only ones with dissatisfaction; I agree with you 100%. I am just trying to come here today to tell you that we are all the same and we have the same aspirations, and the only difference is that Quebec does not want to hope any more if there is no major change in direction.

You know, as long as we keep talking economics and this and that, that is not the issue. The issue is values, the vision, the philosophy, and we have become so materialistic that we are just off target. None of us got into this boat, and I agree we have the same problems, and let's be happy that the country is going through that kind of turmoil. It is a chance we have to make a change. It is like being sick. After an illness, you can see it as a sad thing but you can see it as a very positive thing because it gives you a chance to change orientation in your life, to change direction. This is what your body is telling you if something goes wrong, so I think it is the same thing that the country is going through. But Quebec says, "No, everything you are saying will not change the direction so let's get out."

Mr Winner: This question is more to satisfy my curiosity than anything else. Virtually all of the presentations by francophones or francophone associations have been in French. Did you make any kind of conscious decision whether you were going to present in English or French?

Dr Lanctôt: No. I came here today to meet with you English Canadian people, so I said I would rather speak English if we want to—it is easier, I think, to communicate through the same language than to communicate through a translation. That is why I decided to do a presentation in English.

As far as I am concerned, it does not matter. We came here today to talk with you, heart to heart. It would even be better. That is why I had to use an analogy, because I do

not think that words can translate the problems of the soul. This is what we want to share with you, and if it is easier to do it in English, let's do it in English. If it is easier to do it in French, let's do it in French. But I think French people know what is going on with Quebec. I wanted to share it with English-speaking, anglophone people, so that is why I decided to do it in English.

The Vice-Chair: I have a question I want to ask. You spoke of something that I think this committee has been hearing a lot of, which is that many Canadians, I think, and many Ontarians are feeling the same things as what you saying—that somehow we see that the ship has changed direction and it scares people. We have seen the erosion of our social programs to a certain extent. We have seen that change in philosophy in the way things have been going in the nation.

You speak about getting off the ship. I am just wondering at what point you are able to get back on. If you see that there is goodwill on the part of the rest of Canada in saying: "Listen, we hear. We all understand and we all are feeling the same things. Sometimes we tend to fixate things a little bit more towards Quebec and not look at the fact that western provinces have the same problems, that the Maritimes are feeling alienated, that northern Ontario is feeling alienated. It is not just Quebec."

I guess what I am saying is that if people finally come to realize that and say, "Yes, we do have some problems and we need to address them," and you see that willingness on the part of the rest of Canada, do you think that the Quebec people will be able to say, "Yes, we will stay on the ship and together we will try to steer in the direction that we all want to steer it as Canadians?"

Dr Lanctôt: When I say what Quebecers want, I just try to show you that it is not economics. It is not material problems or considerations. That is why I said it is our soul that is sick, and I said that all Canadians, we all have the same problems.

When I say Quebec wants to leave, I did not decide if Quebec wants to leave or not. Like you, I see that Quebecers want to leave. So what are they going to do if we address the real issues? When I say we, I am talking about Canadians in general. If we address the real issues, what are they going to do? I cannot answer for them, but I definitely think that if we address the real issues, we will cure the real problems, and I do not think there would be any separation.

You see, the problem is, how can you find the right solution if you do not know what the problem is? The problem we have been addressing until now has always been economics and all material problems. It is not a material problem; it is a lack of spirituality. Our society is sick. It is totally dehumanized. Not only Canada—the rest of the world. But we are experiencing the symptoms and the signs of the disease, maybe more or faster than the others. If we address the right problem, we will find the right solution, and I do not see why this country would not remain united, which is what we all deeply want.

CANADIAN PENSIONERS CONCERNED

The Vice-Chair: We would like to call our last group of presenters, the Canadian pensioners concerned. We apologize for the lateness. What happened was a mixup in the schedule.

Ms Harman: You have to admit I am flexible.

The Vice-Chair: Thank God as Canadians we are flexible.

Ms Harman: My name is Mae Harman. I have been watching with fascination these sessions on TV. I have found them informative and often heart-warming and sometimes dismaying. When I asked my friends if they have been watching, they do not seem to have cable and they do not seem to know that this is happening. I would like to propose that you make up a video that could be distributed to organizations because there is great material here and it should be spread around.

I represent the Ontario division of Canadian Pensioners Concerned. Our organization began in 1969 when some people who were about to retire got together to discuss their concerns about pensions. Since that time our membership has grown and our interests have broadened. Seniors now comprise an ever-growing proportion of the population. We have paid taxes of one kind or another all our lives and continue to do so. We have made many contributions to our communities and we will continue to do so. We have paid a proportion of our incomes into retirement plans assuming these funds would be there to help us to live out our retirement years in some comfort and dignity. We are also voters and intend to be heard. A little grey power there.

Our Canadian heritage includes the province of Quebec and Quebec people and their unique heritage of language, culture and history. This lends to Canada special uniqueness which we do not want to lose. Quebec's language and culture must be recognized as making it a distinct society and Quebec must have the right to maintain and develop its language and culture. Similarly, anglophones in Quebec must equally have the right of being educated, receiving government services and conducting their business in English where numbers warrant, and francophones in other parts of Canada must be treated with respect and have opportunities to be educated, conduct their business and receive government services in French where numbers warrant.

The rejection of Meech Lake was not a rejection of Quebec. It was the failure to include women and native people in the agreement and the failure of the whole process to involve the people. The very language of "striking a deal" and "rolling the dice" was repugnant as a substitute for true negotiation, give and take, in the best interests of all citizens.

It has been said that the people of Canada want to have their say. The people do not want just to speak; they want to be heard with understanding and appreciation. They expect respectful reception that digests and analyses what it hears, and responds. It is interesting that a federal government which continually hires pollsters to find out what the

people think does so little to respond to the people's wishes and dissatisfactions, but proceeds on its way with the Prime Minister declaring that he knows what is best for us.

In fact, one is led to believe by their comments that this government is almost totally unaware of the lifestyles of the people in this country and is quite insensitive to what it means to be poor, battered, unemployed, disabled, ill, a native or a refugee. We need some new strategies for influencing majority governments and making members of the Legislature more responsive to their constituents. Perhaps there should be referendums on such important items as trade arrangements and new taxation systems and more opportunities for members to be freed of caucus control to vote as their constituents demand.

Native people and their culture are also a part of our Canadian heritage. If we reject their needs, we cut ourselves off from the richness of their contribution. We must redress the wrongs that have been done them and assist them in becoming self-governing and in preserving their own language and culture. Natives who leave the reservations must be treated with dignity and encouraged to be independent.

Canada has a moral obligation to share its resources, both human and material, with the developing countries, assisting with medical help, education and training, technical equipment and advice and helping them to develop their own potential and self-determination.

Generations of immigrants have contributed to our Canadian mosaic. They have brought and shared a richness of industry, creativity, different cultures and languages, arts, technology and food. They have contributed to the development of our resources and our economy, the development of our communities and the enrichment of our daily living. We must continue to welcome immigrants, especially those who need a refuge from war, persecution, famine and poverty in their own lands. We need to handle their arrival with more sensitivity and speed and assist their integration into their communities with appropriate language classes, education and training, housing, employment and good neighbourliness. Most of us either were or are immigrants.

We should stop talking about the powers of different levels of government and speak instead of responsibilities and shared responsibilities. A strong central government is essential to take care of such matters as defence, relationships with other nations, international treaties, postal services, cross-country transportation, immigration, the Charter of Rights, the Supreme Court, the CBC and the national economy.

Since the days of Lester Pearson, Canada has had an excellent reputation throughout the world as a peacemaker and a peacekeeper. We need to regain our credibility in this regard. As a smaller country, we are in a unique position to play this role which is so badly needed in today's world.

Some of our representatives to the United Nations and its organizations have given strong leadership with regard to peace and peacekeeping, poverty, food and agriculture, rights of children and refugees, etc. A strong central government is needed also to set standards for health, child care, education and training, prevention of poverty, the justice

system, retirement and old age, public housing, unemployment insurance and disability.

Government at the federal level should provide major financing to the provinces for the above services, and through a mechanism such as the Canada assistance plan make certain that services are available to all citizens across Canada on an equal basis. So long as basic standards are met, provinces and municipalities should be able to develop their own programs, taking into account regional differences and needs, and to supplement these services as they see fit.

Our whole system of providing assistance to people in need has become very complex and expensive to administer and needs major overhauling. Some system of guaranteed annual income is needed to eliminate needs testing. A multiplicity of programs and services is required because people cannot finance their basic needs.

The free trade agreement with the USA was a costly mistake in terms of job losses, removal of companies to the USA and bankruptcies. We need to negotiate to see how we can recoup our losses and prevent future losses. We need to avoid getting entangled in a three-way agreement with the USA and Mexico and the resulting further loss of employment and industry. We need to explore the potential for further development of our resources here for more valuable exports. We need to establish new markets in Europe and the Pacific Rim. We need to break down trade barriers between the provinces.

The federal government and the provinces should be able to transcend petty partisan politics and consult and confer regularly with each other in the best interests of the nation. No province should have the right of veto. A majority vote should prevail.

1240

Quebec cannot be dragged, kicking and screaming, into Confederation. An unwilling participant would be detrimental to good government. Every effort should be made to negotiate reasonable expectations of Quebec based on recognition of its unique culture. For example, all responsibility for education and training, immigration and communications might be transferred to Quebec. We sincerely hope that Quebec will not choose to leave Canada and we are reluctant to even think of the negotiations that would be required. All Canadians need to treat with great seriousness the risks that are entailed.

Regional differences and regional needs must be recognized and respected. The federal government has a strong responsibility to help regions develop their resources and provide the services their populations need.

Unemployment should not be allowed to force large numbers of people to leave their home province in search of jobs in another province. An influx of immigrants into a city should not put heavy taxation burdens upon the property owners there to provide for their welfare. The cuts in transfer payments to provinces should be fully restored. They have placed great burdens on the provinces and municipalities already reeling with the setbacks of the recession.

Tuesday's budget indicates further abdication of federal responsibilities, greater burdens on provinces and municipalities and further suffering and loss of dignity for the

unemployed, the poor, the sick and the homeless. It does nothing to encourage national unity.

The federal government should give greater financial encouragement to research and development. Besides being of value to people in general, it would encourage some of our finest young minds to stay and contribute to Canada. Our taxation system needs to be thoroughly overhauled. The previous system of more levels of taxation with the rate rising at each level was more progressive than the present one.

One Voice, a national umbrella organization for seniors, puts it this way: "We are observing, as a result of the government's tax policies, an accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few, while a number of poor Canadians, and their depth of poverty, is increasing rapidly. Food banks are here to stay, it seems, and welfare rolls are bursting with people who are trapped in poverty and cannot escape. The taxation focus on the middle class is causing more and more to slide into the low income categories, while tax breaks continue to serve the wealthy. Many profitable corporations are making no tax contribution to the society in which they operate."

The Vice-Chair: I was just looking through the brief. You have about another three pages and about four minutes to go, whatever way you want to do it.

Ms Harman: Okay. I will just mention that the GST is a regressive and unfair tax. It is especially hard on people with low incomes and it is hard on people who need services which are now taxed, because seniors tend to use those services to a greater degree than other age groups.

I wanted to speak to the clawback. Seniors are dismayed by the clawback on old age security because it is an infringement of entitlement and the first chipping away of the principle of universality. To quote again from One Voice: "The clawback of old age security and family allowance benefits has begun the erosion of the principle of universality of social programs...Seniors deplore this measure and the fact that social policy is thereby being modified through the tax system. There is now considerable fear among seniors and those approaching retirement that a major source of income they had expected will no longer be provided. As partial indexation takes its toll, the clawback will begin to affect thousands of middle income seniors...Many private pensions were negotiated with the understanding that old age security would be received by all eligible Canadians."

I will just mention medicare. Seniors remember a time when there was no medicare and a family could be ruined financially by a major illness. We are troubled when business groups and government spokesmen declare that Canada cannot afford medicare and that there should be deterrent fees and extra billing. We do not want to return to a two-tier system where those who can afford it get health care and the rest get what charity provides. Medicare protects those who are most vulnerable. It allows for preventive medicine and health education. It is a lifeline to the wellbeing of the community and a solid investment in our future. It must not be endangered.

Mr G. Wilson: Thanks very much for your presentation. If you heard the earlier presenter you would find that you had much in common with her. But what made her presentation interesting is that she focused on the feelings that you are raising that are felt by a lot of Quebecers; that is, she compared Canada to a ship and the direction it is sailing is, in her opinion, heading for rocks, and a lot of Quebecers are concerned by that and would like to get off that ship.

It struck me that you are one of the builders of that ship, yet the direction that it seems to be going also is of great concern to you. That would strike you, I think, as particularly hard, that these areas that you mention—in effect, the social safety net that you established and I guess the values of compassion and consideration for others—seem to be being torn apart. I would just like to say that this is what I hear from you. Would you say that is essentially the point you are trying to make, that the direction has to be changed?

Ms Harman: Well, I am a sixth-generation Canadian. I do not want to get off the ship, but I am beginning to think there is some great conspiracy going on here that is trying to do away with all that was Canada, really. I think you have been hearing a lot of anger and a lot of concern and a lot of fear from people who have been speaking to you. Who is in charge of this country and what is going on here? What is the direction, and is it a direction that is going to help people who belong to Canada?

The Vice-Chair: I would like to thank you very much and remind you that it is the job of all citizens of this country to make sure that our governments hear us. We have been getting a lot of comments on behalf of the people coming before us saying that they feel as if the governments are not listening, and in some cases that is good criticism, but I remind people also that it is our responsibility as citizens to go and see our local members of Parliament or MPPs or whatever, to make sure that indeed these things are not happening. I know that for ourselves, as politicians provincially, the reason we got involved was for exactly the things that you talked about, because it scares us as well. We all have a responsibility to make sure that the ship goes in that right direction.

Ms Harman: I think Ontario has the potential for being a real leader in this constitutional mess that we are in, and we look to you, our government, to accept that challenge and to involve us in that.

The Vice-Chair: We accept the responsibility. Thank you.

Ms Harman: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Okay. We are adjourned until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The committee recessed at 1247.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee, in part, resumed at 1405.

The Vice-Chair: We would like to welcome you back to the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are again live from Toronto. We have a list of groups this afternoon, as well as some individuals.

DAVID BAKER

Mr Baker: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the committee. I apologize for any indigestion caused by my presentation. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to speak to you. I want to emphasize that I am speaking in my personal capacity, since time constraints have not permitted any of this to go to my board of directors.

We live in a country which has a great deal for which we all must be grateful. Our current Constitution is not one of those things. The threat of Quebec's separation for me is not only a crisis but an opportunity to correct many long-standing problems. From my vantage point as a human rights lawyer and social policy analyst, I would urge Ontario to play a bold leading role in reshaping Canada rather than its usual conciliatory and beneficent one.

We live in a country where economic powers are decentralized to an unparalleled degree. I note in the *Globe and Mail* today that centralism is supposedly over the hill. I guess that means I am over the hill with it, because I am here to talk about the need for economic centralism. I was shocked to learn the extent of this decentralization while playing a bit part as an articling student representing—along with senior counsel, of course—OPSEU and CUPE in the Anti-Inflation Board reference back in 1977. The Supreme Court ruled in that case that the federal government could only impose wage and price controls in times of national emergency. I remember feeling at the time that I had helped win the battle but had lost my country.

Political scientists explain our unique structure as the product of compromise rather than revolution. Historians say the Fathers of Confederation guessed wrong when they assumed that whichever level of government controlled the ports and ferries, the post office and the railways, would control the economy. The late Chief Justice Bora Laskin blamed the Privy Council for interpreting our trade and commerce clause down to insignificance while the United States Supreme Court was using a similar clause to create a highly centralized governmental structure. Whatever the explanation, economic decentralization is wrong and, in my opinion, must be reversed.

At the same time we have federal and provincial governments neutralizing each other's financial policy initiatives across this country, with Mr Wilson tightening belts at the federal level and perhaps Mr Laughren doing the exact reverse at the provincial level. We have Michael Wilson saying, "Even if the feds aren't contributing a nickel to medicare, we're going to impose standards on the province," dictating how it will spend its money on matters within its exclusive jurisdiction.

You may be wondering why someone in my position would be critical of national standards for medicare. It is

not that I disagree with the standards themselves; in fact, I would entrench them in the Constitution. But I feel it is wrong that the federal government claim credit for national standards when it is not intending to contribute anything towards the implementation of them. I am sure that is cause for concern in many of the provinces, and particularly Quebec, but let me try to explain in a couple of sentences why I feel having a federal role in these areas at all is wrong.

Canada's combined spending on health and social services is about average among industrialized nations. Our spending on medicare is second only to the United States. Our social spending is among the lowest of industrialized nations, however, and this is of course a great source of hardship for people who are poor, including the people I know best, who are disabled people. You might say, "We can't get everything right," but this is precisely my point; not only are we spending a lot on medicare, but we are not spending wisely. We are institutionalizing our seniors at a rate of 10% when Sweden's rate is 2.8%. We pay doctors outrageous fees to perform services which could be performed much better for much less by others. We invest in reactive services such as hospitals rather than in preventive ones such as housing, and we pay for unnecessary operations and have nothing left to feed the hungry.

I think one of the major reasons underlying this and much other stupidity is the overlapping federal-provincial jurisdiction over health and social services. Discussion at the federal level, and in the rooms where discussions go on on a federal-provincial basis, is remote from the complexity one finds when one is directly confronted by a situation where service delivery is required. As a result, elite interests are well entrenched in those discussions, democracy is stymied and the taxpayer dutifully pours his or her dollars down the black hole of the status quo.

Let me turn to the charter and, in particular, the equality right. The equality clause is one of the most important tools in my trade as a constitutional lawyer. The charter is a hard thing for politicians to celebrate because it permits unelected judges to overrule decisions made by elected politicians. As long as the courts get it right—and there is, unfortunately, no guarantee of that—the equality guarantee will enhance Canadian democracy in my opinion, however. The critical question is whether courts will recognize it was intended to benefit members of disadvantaged groups to achieve equality of opportunity; that is, to sweep away the systemic barriers which have created their disadvantage in the first place.

As long as it is not used by members of advantaged groups to deepen the disadvantage of others, half the battle will have been won. The other half of the battle will be to persuade the courts to do anything at all. The conservatism of Canadian courts is long-standing and the two champions of the rights of disadvantaged people, Brian Dickson and Bertha Wilson, have recently retired from the Supreme Court of Canada.

Let me turn to Meech Lake. The Meech Lake accord was a behind-closed-doors attempt to appease Quebec. By cryptically dubbing the province a distinct society and transferring a host of powers not only to Quebec but to all provinces off Quebec's wish list, the first ministers, including the hesitant social democratic Premier of Manitoba, hoped to paper over the problems and get on with business as usual here in Canada.

Disadvantaged groups regarded the "distinct society" clause as a threat to the paramountcy of their hard-won equality guarantee. Economic centralists such as myself felt that the accelerating balkanization of Canada was simply speeding the country's demise. Meech Lake's failure gives us the opportunity to get it right. I will remind you, if we fail again to reach agreement, Quebec will separate.

Quebec's separation would be cause for regret but, in my opinion, should not be regarded as the end of the world. Ontario is comparable in size to Sweden, it is comparable in population, resources and climate and a host of other ways. Sweden enjoys the second highest standard of living in the world and has governmental and economic institutions we would do well to emulate. We should make every effort to address Quebec's legitimate aspirations. But if the national interest is to be compromised, I would hope Ontario would say "enough," call a halt to the process and consider what options there are to take into account a country without Quebec. My recommendations then:

1. The French fact must be entrenched in a country where the overwhelmingly dominant culture is English. I have not given up on Trudeau's vision of a bilingual country. In fact, having been granted probably the only sabbatical I will ever have, I am going to be spending a large part of it improving my French. Ultimately it is Quebec, as the weaker partner—that is, the French partner—which must judge whether bilingualism is a success or a failure. In my opinion, it is presumptive for the dominant English culture to make judgements on that, and therefore they are going to have to decide whether or not bilingualism is working.

2. Virtually all of the powers sought by Quebec, as outlined in the Allaire report, are legitimately linked to predicting the French fact. They are also the kinds of powers which provinces can more effectively exercise than the federal government because of regional disparities. Overlapping jurisdiction, in my opinion, in these areas has been a disaster, contributing to the legitimate perception that at one and the same time we are both overgoverned and lack leadership in this country. In short, I do not think the shopping list in the Allaire report is an unreasonable shopping list.

3. The federal role of conditionally cost-sharing provincial services must be phased out, as painful as that will be. In place of cost-sharing there should be a transfer of tax points. Federal standards beyond necessity for reciprocity structures should be a thing of the past.

4. Related to number 3, the corrupt and moribund institution of the Senate should be abolished. The proposal of a triple E Senate should be rejected as antidemocratic. In its place we should entrench a mechanism for redistributing resources from the richer to the poorer provinces. Perhaps a parallel would be helpful in illustrating why this is necessary.

In the United States each school district is left to its own devices for funding. Through gerrymandered boundaries and the constructions of suburbs designed for the wealthy, rich whites have excellent public schools and poor blacks have inadequate ones in inner cities. In Ontario we have a redistributive mechanism for education funding. While imperfect, it is a big improvement over the American system. This is precisely the kind of mechanism we should be entrenching into our Constitution to ensure that we do not have ghettoized provinces living side by side with wealthy ones.

5. The federal government must be given the control it requires to position Canada in an increasingly global economy. To my mind it is a joke; when we have a decentralized economy in a world where we have to be able to make some important decisions, we are simply incapable of making them. Provincial jurisdiction over financial institutions, labour relations, industrial development, natural resources, energy and the environment should be transferred to the federal government. Countries such as Germany, Japan and Sweden have highly centralized governments on economic, labour and environmental issues and clearly they are the big winners in the world economy. Sweden in particular has achieved great success through a strong labour movement, a commitment to an industrial strategy based on strong export performance, conservation and regeneration of natural resources and environmental protection. As long as provinces are competing with each other for job-producing industries, we simply undercut each other and the country will not be able to develop strong standards in these areas, whatever the goodwill or intention among provincial governments individually may be.

6. My sixth point is simply this: The equality rights section should be amended to ensure that it only benefits members of disadvantaged groups. We do not want to see it used by men to disadvantage further women, able-bodied people, similarly to disadvantage disabled people and so on. This would permit the repeal of section 15(2), which is the affirmative action clause, which is unfortunately creating unnecessary confusion in the courts and can in fact turn out to be something which is used against disadvantaged people.

Thank you once again for giving me the opportunity of sharing these concerns with you. I hope you all get some sleep and those are my suggestions.

The Vice-Chair: Sleep is something we have been lacking. We would like to thank you for your brief. Obviously very well prepared and well thought out. We do have a question.

Mr Winninger: I too would like to thank you and I know you have been providing outstanding advocacy over the past few years. My question relates to national standards and cost-sharing. We have been hearing repeatedly that what holds this nation together is the way we care for our citizens. Strong national standards such as access to universal health care is something that should continue to be entrenched in our Constitution. You know, recently Quebec started charging a fee of \$5 for certain emergency

services. Would it concern you then that cost-sharing is phased and there be a transfer of tax points unless there is some kind of assurance that the national standards that Canadians have grown accustomed to would survive under such a change?

Mr Baker: Okay, so you are going straight for my jugular here. My concern is this: that the federal government intends to take credit for the national standards and not contribute a penny for implementing them. I say that is a joke. If we want to entrench national standards in the Constitution, let's do it. I do not have any problem with taking the standards set out for medicare and putting them in the Constitution if we feel that way about it. I am concerned about resources, and I am concerned about the fact that we are spending too much on doctors and hospitals and not enough on housing and welfare and things that keep people out of the hands of doctors and hospitals. If we have the resources to entrench something like that, I say do it. I am concerned about what will happen in British Columbia with the current government. I am concerned what would happen in PEI without national standards.

1420

At the same time I do believe—and ultimately I think this is the point Quebec is making to us—that we have to accept that the provinces are big people and are able to make big decisions themselves, and make big mistakes perhaps and learn from those mistakes. I think people who live in Alberta and BC have to take responsibility for communicating to very right-wing governments that that is not acceptable, and perhaps that means the right-wing government is not acceptable.

But ultimately I think Quebec is going to object strongly to the existence of those national standards and we have to do something perhaps that involves weaning ourselves away from the current system that we have, mindful as I am that it could cause catastrophes in the short, medium and perhaps even the long term in some provinces.

The Vice-Chair: I am going to have to cut it there because we are running behind. Thank you very much.

ISLAMIC CO-ORDINATING COUNCIL, TORONTO

The Vice-Chair: The Islamic Co-ordinating Council. Would ask Mrs O'Neill to come and replace the Chair.

Mr Zafar: Thank you very much. I would like to begin by thanking the select committee on Ontario in Confederation to provide this opportunity for us to present our brief that we have designated as the Spirit of Ontario.

My colleague Imam Abdul Hai Patel and others have participated and contributed towards this brief.

For the last two years, perhaps more, the world watches with wonder at what is happening to Canada, a country respected all over the world as the model of civilized behaviour, tolerance and compassion, fighting over issues like language rights and the breaking up of the country as such.

The remarkable debate that is raging right across our wonderful land has become intensely personal and emotional. The basic root of our Canadian national character of

being compassionate is being questioned, both with vigour and with sometimes racist overtones. Hence, never before in the history of our country, has the province of Ontario been urged to come forward and create what we are calling the spirit of Ontario.

We will deal specifically with the spirit of Ontario later, but we feel that we should address ourselves to the challenges of the 21st century, and there are a number of issues that Ontario must examine clearly in the development of a constitutional relationship with the federal government and with the rest of the country.

First and foremost, the spirit of Ontario must be spelled out clearly and effectively. What is the basic and futuristic spirit of Ontario? The spirit of Ontario in Confederation is the spirit of tolerance, compassion and progress.

The spirit of Ontario within its provincial boundary exhibits the spirit of multiculturalism as working together, an example for other provinces perhaps to witness that in Ontario there are over 125 different languages spoken. Right in the heart of Toronto we proudly exhibit street signs in such languages as Chinese and Greek. Here, within our provincial borders, the largest number of recent immigrants have settled. To mention a few, they are from such faraway countries as India, Pakistan, Iran and the Philippines. They all call Canada their home. Here in Ontario the Italians, the Portuguese, the Germans, all have moulded together along with the Chinese, Japanese, in calling Ontario their home.

Here in Ontario I would like to point out to all of you that we have a mosque and a synagogue that share not only the common fences but also the parking lot, and I would suggest to this committee that one Saturday when the Jewish citizens of our province are celebrating their Sabbath, Muslims are parking to come for sunset prayers in the adjacent mosque. Friends, this is the spirit of Ontario, and truly Ontario should be calling itself a distinct society and a model for other provinces to emulate. The spirit of Ontario generates a distinct and unique character for all the provinces to display to all from coast to coast.

Having defined what we mean by the spirit of Ontario, let us now move to the second point, on the issue of economy and international trade.

Perhaps most of you know the exact breakdown of overseas trade of our province, but we believe that many Ontario manufacturers are capable of and interested in exporting but lack the financial and human resources to develop new markets. Whereas the province of Quebec, under some special arrangements with the federal government, continues to expand and establish export markets, here in Ontario we are still dicker over how important offshore trade is. We have yet to develop an Ontario trading corporation that could provide a complete set of trade-related services covering both general and the capital projects. How could we achieve this?

It is a true but oft-repeated cliché that the progress of any economy is the effective use of human and financial resources. It is certainly very true for Ontario.

The rich ethnic mosaic of Ontario could provide business and, in particular, the government, the untapped and underutilized cadre for overseas trade development. Unfortunately,

our Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology ignores this aspect. The entrenched self-serving attitude refuses to give opportunities to harness the rich human resources available in our province. Should we decide to harness our human resources, we could easily become more competitive internationally.

The second point we wish to bring to your attention, as the Muslims all over Ontario and right across our land have asked to do, in particular those Muslims living in the province of Quebec, where there are many Muslim migrants from French-speaking countries who call Quebec in Canada their home. They are comfortable with the French language and culture. Furthermore, they feel proud that when travelling on vacations in certain parts of Ontario, the French language, culture and customs are respected. After all, Canada as we know today has been established by the two founding cultures, along with our native people. Hence, we support the selective availability of the French language, as well as the resumption of new dialogue with the federal government dealing with the rights and obligations of the native people.

The present arrangements between the provinces and the federal government are inadequate for the 21st century. The federal government should consider, in our view, transferring some funds and some of the responsibilities to the native people to the provinces. Let a compassionate government like the one in place in Ontario deal with the economic and social needs of our native people.

1430

What bothers us most is that so much has been talked and written about the question of Quebec in recent years that it boggles the mind of common, decent Canadians, and Ontarians are no exception. In this regard, we Muslims believe that Canada without Quebec is a meal without salt. It is the French presence that gives uniqueness to our land from sea to sea. Quebec is a distinct society. We have no argument with this, as we have stated earlier how the spirit of Ontario has propelled Ontario to be both unique and a distinct society. Our province should enhance interprovincial trade. It is the ties of trade and tolerance that should bring people together, not politicians.

Finally, in Ontario men of ideas are needed, men and women who will move forward without being deterred by hesitancy or doubt or discouraged by difficulties or hazards. For the spirit of Ontario and its relationship with other parts of Canada, we need such men and women of vision, not of petty jealousies and hangups.

We have dealt rather hurriedly with some of the challenges that Ontario faces as Canadians gear up to build around a united country and perhaps around a new Constitution. With all this talk of languages, in particular French, perhaps we are forgetting another important aspect of our province: that Ontario's social services towards poor and the elderly, towards those individuals and families that are caught in the economic downturn, should be compassionately updated. This is the challenge to the business community.

We believe that a compassionate capitalism is well entrenched in the spirit of Ontario. The present government should only have to tap the vast resources of goodwill among business and union leaders. Business and union

leaders are not antagonistic to each other; they are complementary to building a dynamic and just society.

Once again, thank you for giving us the opportunity to share with you the points of view of 160,000 Muslims who call Ontario and Canada their home.

I leave with a prayer: May God bless the spirit of Ontario and open the hearts of our citizens and make Canada a united country. Thank you very much.

Mr G. Wilson: I was interested to see that you have appealed to what you call the spirit of Ontario and how that spirit obviously pre-dates the arrival of, I guess, you people as well as—well, let's just centre on that for a moment. You find that there are things appealing there that go beyond individual groups in society and I was wondering whether you could say how we could foster that spirit.

Mr Zafar: I am glad that you asked this question. I have lived here for the last 30 years, and when I first migrated early in 1961, I felt that there was no funding of the multicultural program. People came here. I used to spend wonderful Sunday afternoons being a Muslim in a small town called Thorold. Some of you may not know that one went to the Presbyterian or United Church and cookies and candies were given on Sunday. That route has been lost. That route of compassion, self-help, has been lost.

Instead of that, somehow we got caught ourselves into the government funding the multicultural program. That was initially a good thing. In marketing terms, there is a product life cycle. It has reached the plateau point. We should bring for the 21st century an encouragement for the linguistically and culturally sensitive people of Ontario to develop the trade of Ontario. Who would be better to sell Ontario products than second- and third-generation Italians going to Italy? I can tell you, they are the best. Who would be the best to sell Ontario goods and services in Delhi than second- and third-generation people who have originated from the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent? As you know, sir, as a member of the ruling party, for the last year we have not yet filled the position in New Delhi of senior representative. That is a hell of a waste.

What I am saying, even if I would go further for all parties to understand, is that should we really believe that Ontario is a multicultural society, Ontario is looking forward to the 21st century, then perhaps instead of having a political patronage appointment as an agent general in London, we should give our mother country, the United Kingdom, the first coloured agent general there. So this is the spirit of Ontario, a unique experiment which is working.

The Acting Chair (Mrs Y. O'Neill): Thank you very much.

COMMITTEE ON THE FUTURE OF CANADA

The Acting Chair: The next group, the Committee on the Future of Canada. I understand that you three ladies—Ms Maybee, Ms Shariff and Ms Varaleau—want to divide the time. Does that mean you want to use your full time, five minutes each, or do you want to try to condense it to three to four minutes and have time for questions?

Ms Varaleau: I think the way we have positioned it is that I will have five minutes and you will speak for five

minutes, Rose, and Alies for two minutes, so we will have a little bit of time left over for questions as well.

The Acting Chair: All right, let's begin, please.

Ms Varaleau: Okay, this is a brief introduction. My name is Darlene Varaleau. On my left is Rose Shariff and on my right is Alies Maybee. We are members of a committee which was struck as a result of an equality eve celebration. It is our belief that women bring a different perspective to all issues in Canada and we are very concerned that women's voice and perspective be heard on this issue in particular.

The Acting Chair: Okay, thank you for putting this in perspective.

Ms Varaleau: Our discussion ranged into some of the principles that we feel need to be addressed when looking at the future of Canada, and specifically the Constitution, so our discussion was somewhat general and becomes more specific later. At the first, we started about, "Well, everybody is talking about the Canadian identity," and we were saying that there is very much in the Canadian identity to be proud of and in particular a very strong political system, an excellent legal system. We have great wealth in the country and a social network, but also part of the identity that we have is a commercial sector which is not very competitive. We see it as not being internationally competitive and being very risk-averse, and we feel that is also part of our Canadian identity. Also, we see the Canadian government as not managing our resources effectively, which leads us to believe that we are somehow not competent managers of our resources, and that, true, also is part of the Canadian identity and something that people may not express but is actually part of the Canadian conscience.

We believe that Canadians have to understand better the relationship between business and the sense of wellbeing that we have in the country and our standard of living and that we have to address the commercial sector and the public management of our resources strongly.

All three of us are very active politically and we had very specific concerns about the political process in Canada. In particular, we think that our political process is excellent. I recently returned from a trip around the world and have nothing but extreme admiration for everything in Canada and, in particular, our political process, but there are some things that I see in my involvement, and one is that our political process has got a lot of gamesmanship to it. You know, a lot of people enter the process like it is a game, as opposed to what they can contribute to Canada as a whole, and we think a lot of this deals with what happens at the nomination level, where it is a matter of going out and getting a lot of memberships in the riding. It does not have a lot to do with thoughtful policy thinking and that is the fault of the parties. They need to be addressing this. Some of them are, I am not sure very rigorously, but it affects the quality of people who we attract to the political arena.

Another thing is that we have some great people in there, but they seem to take the approach that they can fool Canadians. The idea is to trick Canadians into believing that their message is the right message, as opposed to listening

and responding to what the public wants and providing some strong leadership and engaging people in that process.

1440

Another aspect that we feel is extremely wrong in the way we are governing ourselves is the whip system in the political process. We seem to have parties that vote en bloc. How is the public supposed to affect their politicians when the parties are voting en bloc and they do not have another four years to do anything about it? This is particularly an issue in our federal government, where we have something like a 75% majority when it only had 43% of the vote. So when you vote en bloc, how does that reflect the diversity of our culture? That is a party issue—that is not something that is legislated—that parties have to vote en bloc.

The other thing is that we cannot get rid of our leaders. If we are upset with them, we cannot get rid of them. We see this in a lot of different cases and I have been told not to name names, but we know who those people are. It takes for ever, and they will drag down the party and they will drag down the nation before they will depart. We would like to see something more like the British system, where the caucus gets together and out the person goes, more quickly than our system allows for.

With respect to constitutional change, we believe, although this process is wonderful, it is very broad, that ultimately we have to address a specific document and have people respond in a context in order to focus on issues. The people, the different groups across Canada, need time to address their membership. They are not going to be able to do that in a two-month process or whatever. We should consider a public referendum, although we do not, as a group, have a clear idea of whether, yes, a referendum is the way to go or not. But it should be considered in terms of addressing public opinion.

We believe there are three principles that must dominate the discussion with respect to the Constitution. I believe, and I have not consulted any polls on this, that Canadians want a strong federal government. If we look historically at what our premiers do, and now our Prime Minister, they are continually pulling away from the centre to gain provincial powers. I do not believe that is what Canadians want, and certainly in the 1981 discussions when Trudeau was on the scene, he kept threatening to go over the premiers' heads to the people with respect to the charter, and, I believe, to a strong central government. If the discussion continues to promote the idea of decentralization, I feel the Canadian people are going to continue to react to the proposals and eventually kick people out of office, so that we are going to be involved in this discussion ad nauseam.

Another principle that must be governed is again—and this was true in 1981 when Trudeau was going over the heads of the people—the Canadian people like the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We do not want that eroded. Women, in particular, do not want that eroded, although the Quebec women seemed to bend on that last time. But in general, Canadians like the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We do not want any province to have a veto over the Constitution. It did not work in Meech Lake. I have a

background in the west, and the west certainly is not interested in Ontario being a veto power in the future.

We are also saying that the economy is a critical issue. I guess it is a concern about, "Let's be expeditious about this," because if we are going to go on and on ad nauseam about our Canadian identity, our economy is suffering dramatically and that is also part of the Canadian identity and needs to be addressed expeditiously.

In conclusion, on my part, I want to thank you for the opportunity. What this process did for us is it forced us to come together and formulate our thoughts and be clear about what we as Canadians wanted and, I believe, what we as women wanted. So I thank you for the opportunity to address you.

The Acting Chair: Did you use our discussion paper as the basis for your discussion?

Ms Varaleau: I received it and looked at it and I thought it was great, and no, we did not.

The Acting Chair: I understand that you would like to add some comments.

Ms Maybee: I think Rose will go first.

Ms Shariff: Yes, I will continue where Darlene has left off. My name is Rose Shariff and I have attached an appendix, the last two pages. Canada needs an economic Constitution. Canada is in crisis, but it is not bankrupt. Canada has the resources to top the list as one of the richest countries in the Group of Seven industrialized countries by the turn of the century. What Canada needs to charge confidently into the 21st century is an economic constitution.

Let's face it: The real source of power in any country is economic strength, based on the dynamic qualities of its components. A strong economy is the pillar for any country's security of its sociocultural and political sovereignty, but the tragic state of our economic-financial affairs in Canada points to the failure of our government to provide a real entrepreneurial revolution to steer the Canadian economy towards the dynamism required when it is most needed. Ottawa has failed in economic federalism, unable to design a Canadian model of economic development at a time when the rest of the world is moving confidently towards economic integration in this shrunken global village.

The present government's naïve reliance on market forces is startling when the governments of the United States, Japan and Germany take on massive responsibilities in the economy. The lack of fiscal restraint points to the tragic lack of imagination on the part of our government. Our public finances are in a sordid state. Ottawa has traded too many concessions in economic resources, energy, our social programs and now our intellectual property to our neo-colonial masters in the United States protectionist Senate.

Canada is unable to improve productivity fast enough to keep pace with and to protect its place in constantly increasing global competition. We are not performing in the research and development field. Canada is stepping back in the training and retraining of its workforce. Canada is dismantling the very fabric of our programs that made us the envy of the industrialized world to appease the ever-

protectionist US Senate under the free trade agreement. Federalism, as we envisaged it as Canadians, has failed us.

To rejuvenate and revitalize Canada, we must address the real issues. We need new creative thinking to refresh our sources of pride. Our confidence in our identity as Canadians will grow when we, as Canadians, are in control of our economy. We have to move towards the 21st century, and the 21st century is a century of communities of societies, similar to the European Community. Canada is already a community of societies, unique in our tradition of tolerance, justice and democracy. It is incumbent upon all of us to continue to work hard to reinvent a strong economic, political and social entity, a whole entity so that our country, Canada, can take its proud place in the new world again.

The Acting Chair: Did you have another statement?

Ms Maybee: My name is Alies Maybee. Unlike Rose, I am not in any way an expert on economics. I feel that she is very right, that we do need the economic thing. My concern is that we do not have an articulated vision of who we are as a nation, and I feel very strongly that a country without an articulated vision of who we are and what we want to be is like a company without a mission statement. If you run a company solely for the purpose of making money, you do not do as well as if you run a company for the purpose of delivering the best darned good or service you have got. I think for a country, we need to say: "This is the kind of society that we want. This is what we are, this is what we want and this is how we want to get better," and the byproduct of that will be a vitalized economy. This is not to in any way disregard some of the emphasis that Rose has put.

I feel we do not lack an identity; what we lack is the articulation of our identity. I feel very strongly that there are three Canadian characteristics which have been demonstrably Canadian since the start, the first and I think the most important of which is that we have developed as a nation through an enormous tolerance for otherness. The very fact that we had two founding European nations that were able to agree to disagree on how we managed our civil matters and so on and so forth and to tolerate and respect the differences of religion, etc, set the foundation for the nation that we have today, where we have enormous tolerance not only for the French and for the English in this country but for all those who have reached out and come to this country, because we have demonstrated that. So we now have a multinational nation.

1450

I believe that has led to taking the experiment beyond our boundaries, and with Pearson and people like him, we have seen ourselves as a peacekeeping nation. We have some experiments here that we can offer the world in terms of how we can work together as a community of nations.

I think the other characteristic that is very demonstrably Canadian—you see it in some other countries—is a strong belief in the community responsibility. This is not a nation of every man for himself. We have looked from the strong regions to supporting the weaker regions. We have looked to develop socialized medicine and so on and so forth, and

I think that is all a part of the sort of respect we have for other people and other ways of being. But I think we need to talk about that. I think we need to say, "This is what we want to continue with," and to set up our government so that it reflects that.

In terms of the mechanics, I do not have very much to add to what my fellow members have said, but that is just what I wanted to add at this point. So I will close at this moment with thanking you all very, very much for listening to us and for offering us the opportunity to wrestle with these things instead of gnash our teeth at home.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. A lot of the discussion that took place was about the Constitution being an economic constitution and meeting particular needs. I am wondering if you might share with us whether you feel a constitution should be that specific, or rather it should be an articulation of some of the values that we hold, and then it is up to the respective governments to use those values in terms of policies which we may accept or reject, agree with or disagree with in varying degrees. But in its essence, the constitution should not be, "Do this, do that," but rather, "This is what is important to us."

Ms Varaleau: I see the constitution as a context within which we operate. It is not all, "Do this, do that," no, I agree.

The Acting Chair: Thank you all very much for a very interesting presentation.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO

The Acting Chair: I call Madame Legault and Monsieur Tanguay of the Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario.

Mr Bisson will resume the Chair.

M. Tanguay : Quand on me questionne sur le rôle que doit jouer l'Ontario dans la restructuration inévitable de la constitution canadienne, en tant que francophone qui a passé les 54 années de sa vie en Ontario, j'ai des réponses à donner. Nul doute que ces réponses prennent une couleur particulière, celle d'un Franco-Ontarien qui se souvient d'un passé pas souvent facile, qui vit un présent plus prometteur et qui espère un avenir équitable, rempli d'épanouissement social, économique et culturel dans une participation totale dans l'avenir de sa province et de son pays.

Être un francophone en Ontario, l'avoir été toute sa vie et l'être demeuré en soi représente un haut fait de vie pour tous les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes, qui devraient être décorés sur la place publique d'une croix d'honneur pour service rendu à leur province, à leur patrie. Cet attachement a permis à la province d'occuper une place spéciale dans la Confédération canadienne et dans le monde de la diplomatie internationale.

Le francophone est un patriote, un fier, un fils fidèle qui ne vit que pour l'épanouissement de sa race, de ses traditions, de son pays.

C'est avec tous ces francophones de toujours, de vieille souche ou nouvellement arrivés que je m'associe aujourd'hui pour vous dire ce que je crois être le mandat de l'Ontario en ces temps difficiles.

Ce n'est pas par hasard que j'ai choisi de témoigner ici à Toronto, la métropole du Canada, la capitale de notre belle province. Je veux assumer tout le poids de mon rôle de président de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario et montrer que nous avons tous notre place bien au coeur de cette province qui sans nous non seulement n'aurait pas le même visage, mais n'aurait pas non plus tout le brio, le panache, le poids politique tant sur le plan national qu'international que confère le fait de participer deux grandes cultures qui ont façonné le monde occidental.

Dans cette démarche qui doit nous amener à un nouveau pacte entre tous les intervenants de ce pays, il est essentiel de ne pas oublier le rôle primordial qu'ont joué ces deux cultures de base. De plus, il est grand temps qu'on admette dans le giron politique de notre pays, de notre province ces peuples d'origines qui étaient là bien avant nous et dont nous avons trop souvent ignoré la voix.

La véritable Confédération de demain se devrait de respecter les traditions, les droits acquis et les particularités socio-économiques et culturelles de ces groupes même si cela demande une nouvelle répartition des pouvoirs entre les différents paliers du gouvernement.

Il nous semble facile à nous, francophones de l'Ontario, de saisir les motifs qui ont amené certains Canadiens à préconiser un nouveau pacte constitutionnel. Vivre un partenariat quand les partenaires ne sont pas considérés comme égaux, nourrir des aspirations politiques, économiques, sociales et culturelles quand tous les moyens de répondre à ces aspirations sont contrôlés par l'un ou l'autre des partenaires en exclusivité ne sont que quelques exemples de situations qui expliquent aisément le désaccord fondamental de certains groupes de Canadiens.

La nouvelle constitution doit reconnaître aux trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, aux autochtones, aux francophones et aux anglophones, une place prépondérante dans le partage des pouvoirs et des responsabilités.

La nouvelle constitution doit reconnaître aussi que depuis le début de ce beau pays, de nombreuses générations de néo-Canadiens et de néo-Canadiennes ont reconnu cette dualité linguistique de notre pays et se sont jointes à l'un ou l'autre de ces deux peuples pour en enrichir le développement et la culture.

L'Ontario ne peut pas oublier. Il ne doit pas refuser de reconnaître le rôle primordial de la communauté de langue française dans la découverte et le développement de la province. Depuis au-delà de trois siècles, ces francophones participent activement à la réalité quotidienne de notre province. C'est beaucoup de temps, trois siècles, pour un jeune pays comme le nôtre et c'est difficile à effacer de la réalité, des choses et de l'histoire.

Des exposés savants vous ont présenté à profusion toutes les facettes du rôle que l'Ontario pourrait jouer dans la redéfinition de notre constitution canadienne. Ce n'est pas mon intention d'y revenir à fond ici. Il est cependant un aspect sur lequel je me dois d'insister car je crois qu'il est primordial. L'Ontario doit assumer un leadership certain. Il doit remplir le rôle de chef de file. Il est vrai de l'histoire de l'Ontario depuis l'Acte d'Union de 1840, où il y a eu la première entente politique entre les deux peuples fondateurs, qu'elle n'a pas brillé particulièrement par sa tolérance envers

les francophones qui se sont retrouvés de son côté de la frontière.

Même si leur présence sur les territoires ontariens remontait au tout début de la colonie, au-delà de deux siècles en certains cas, et même si le régime anglais n'existait que depuis moins d'un siècle à ce moment, l'histoire n'a pas pesé très lourd dans les décisions politiques qui ont prévalu jusqu'à tout récemment. Le Règlement 17 n'est pas très loin.

1500

Pourtant, les francophones ne se sont jamais démentis dans la poursuite des idéaux à tous les citoyens de cette province. Comme tous les autres citoyens, ils ont aspiré à la reconnaissance de leur droit à la différence, à leur propre culture et surtout à leur langue.

Dès le début, ils auraient bien voulu que leurs droits soient respectés comme l'ont été ceux des anglophones minoritaires de la province voisine, particulièrement dans le domaine de l'éducation avec les résultats qu'on sait : cent ans plus tard, d'un côté, un système complet d'écoles élémentaires et secondaires avec des conseils scolaires autonomes ; des écoles du niveau collégial selon la demande ; et comme couronnement, trois universités—pas des universités bilingues—McGill, Concordia et Bishop bien à eux de langue anglaise. Pas mal du tout pour une minorité. Nous voudrions bien nous sentir minoritaires, mais nous en sommes encore au niveau des commissions d'enquêtes. Il n'est pas étonnant, dans les circonstances, qu'on nous rappelle, en ayant l'air de nous le reprocher, qu'on n'a pas de tradition d'études universitaires chez les francophones et que notre scolarité à ce niveau n'est pas à l'égal de l'ensemble de la population. Comment voulez-vous développer une tradition ? C'est presque du cynisme.

L'image que nous avons véhiculé tout au long de ces années de dures luttes pour obtenir la moindre parcelle de nos droits dans des domaines de première importance me porte à comprendre que le Québec se soit décidé à ne plus vouloir subir ce sort. Qu'il ait décidé qu'il en avait assez d'être traité en minoritaire — nous savons ce que cela veut dire et nous pouvons comprendre — ne nous surprend pas. Cela nous afflige profondément que dans cette démarche ce soit le Canada tout entier qui risque de sombrer.

Ne serait-ce pas grand temps que la province de l'Ontario se décide à jouer, pendant qu'il est encore temps, un rôle d'exemple et de leader et rende enfin justice où justice doit être rendue ; qu'enfin elle reconnaisse pleinement qu'il existe au Canada des langues officielles et des peuples fondateurs ?

Mais l'histoire prend un autre tournant. Que notre gouvernement cesse de nous affubler de commissions d'enquête de toutes sortes et de toutes les sauces. Qu'on cesse de faire des études pour démontrer des évidences : études sur les conseils scolaires, sur la gestion de nos programmes, sur les collèges, sur les études supérieures, sur les services de santé, sur les services sociaux et communautaires, enfin tout ce qui en temps normal dans une communauté normale apparaît comme une réponse normale à un besoin normal.

Mais quand c'est en français, tout devient problématique. Il ne faut pas faire de vagues, il ne faut pas déranger et surtout pas éveiller la majorité car la majorité depuis

toujours a été habituée par les gouvernements majoritaires à questionner tout ce qui n'est pas conforme, tout ce qui est différent. Ainsi s'installe la peur, la peur du changement, la peur de ce qu'on ne connaît pas, la peur de l'autre et de la menace qu'il semble représenter, la peur de perdre des privilèges qu'on perçoit comme menacés par le partage.

Les francophones de l'Ontario demandent donc au gouvernement de l'Ontario de prendre position dès maintenant d'affirmer devant l'ensemble du pays quelles sont ses croyances et ses attentes face à cette restructuration. L'Ontario doit indiquer clairement ses positions face aux questions fondamentales en litige, à savoir la place de la différence, des valeurs spécifiques, des revendications territoriales, économiques, linguistiques et culturelles des peuples fondateurs de notre pays.

C'est surtout cet Ontario qui a actuellement les yeux rivés : les jeunes de la province, eux qui contrairement à ceux d'un certain âge, ne vivent que l'espoir et l'ouverture. C'est le sort des jeunes qu'on est en train de jouer aujourd'hui. En sommes-nous suffisamment conscients ? Écoutons-nous cette voix de la jeunesse qui, elle, sait dépasser toutes nos petites mesquineries de cuisine et voir au-delà des frontières provinciales le monde entier qui les interpelle ? Allons-nous longtemps véhiculer en leur nom, au nom de leur avenir des valeurs qu'ils jugent déjà bien périmées ?

Eux savent ce qu'est la valeur d'une autre langue et ça ne leur fait pas peur. Eux savent ce que c'est de partager leur culture avec l'autre. Cela non plus ne les menace pas, bien au contraire, ils savent que c'est la manière de demain de s'enrichir. Savons-nous écouter leur message ?

Comment l'Ontario doit-il se définir face à ceux qui voient dans le statu quo une situation intenable ?

D'abord, il doit être perçu comme un élément de grande tolérance face aux multiples facettes que présente de plus en plus la population qui la compose car en plus des peuples d'origines, les autochtones, les francophones, et les anglophones, il y a tous ceux qui choisissent de venir se joindre à nous pour former une nouvelle nation aux multiples valeurs et dans laquelle ils peuvent s'intégrer et se joindre aux grandes cultures de base.

Ainsi, l'Ontario donnera l'exemple d'une province culturellement ouverte et économiquement prête à affronter les défis du XXI^e siècle.

Fort de cette ouverture envers ses minorités, il pourra exercer un leadership éclairé sur l'ensemble des provinces et travailler efficacement à l'établissement d'un mode de fonctionnement juste et équitable pour tous.

L'Ontario doit être un modèle à suivre dans ses rapports avec les peuples autochtones afin de définir un terrain d'entente qui rende justice à ses premiers habitants de la terre canadienne. Pourquoi l'Ontario ne donnerait-il pas enfin à ses francophones la chance d'exercer leurs droits pleinement, non goutte à goutte, et sans avoir à livrer une bataille pour démontrer qu'ils sont là, qu'ils le veulent et qu'ils y ont droit ?

Si on a pu voir la culture franco-ontarienne fleurir d'une telle façon, si on a pu voir surgir écrivains, dramaturges, artistes, poètes de toutes sortes en si grands nombres dans un milieu qui lui a été si longtemps hostile ou indifférent,

combien alors pourra s'enorgueillir la province de ses filles et de ses fils qui brilleront en son nom à travers ce grand pays qu'est le nôtre et dans tout le monde de la francophonie si on lui permet de rayonner, si on l'encourage et si on lui reconnaît la place qui lui revient. La culture est l'indice de la vitalité d'un peuple. Le peuple de l'Ontario peut et doit briller des mille feux de ses cultures diversifiées, rien de moins.

Ainsi, ceux qui prétendent qu'on ne peut s'épanouir, qu'on ne peut vivre comme francophones hors Québec auraient devant eux la preuve qu'une province qui se prétend à juste titre être le cœur de notre pays est en effet ce cœur assez grand qui peut accueillir et donner à l'autre la reconnaissance officielle.

Les francophones de cette province, peu importe l'issu du nouveau pacte constitutionnel, n'auront de repos jusqu'au moment où on les reconnaîtra officiellement comme entité à part entière où on leur donnera les moyens d'assumer pleinement et d'une façon autonome l'éducation de leurs jeunes à tous les niveaux, où ils se sentiront en position d'apporter toute la richesse de leurs talents à la construction de cette province, leur province, de ce pays, leur pays. Merci beaucoup.

M. Winner : Beaucoup de gens qui nous ont fait une présentation ont dit que le Québec, dans la Loi 101 et aussi dans la Loi 178, a nié les mêmes droits que vous désirez avoir en Ontario. Avez-vous une réponse à ça ?

M. Tanguay : Il y a quelques années de ça, alors que je rencontrais personnellement le président d'Alliance Québec du temps — il y a peut-être dix ans alors que la Loi 101 était en vigueur au Québec — j'ai fait remarquer au président de l'Alliance Québec à ce moment-là que si on avait les mêmes services, la même reconnaissance que les Anglo-Québécois avaient à ce moment-là, il s'agirait pour le gouvernement de l'Ontario de peut-être centupler les services qui existaient à ce moment-là en Ontario.

Ça ne veut pas dire que je ne crois pas que la reconnaissance des deux langues officielles soit bel et bien respectée dans leur essence même. Mais d'autre part, nous avons beaucoup de chemin à faire en Ontario avant qu'on puisse reconnaître que les services qui sont disponibles à notre population anglophone dans le Québec soient égaux.

1510

Mr Offer: My question has to do with the role of Ontario, and you have indicated on more than one occasion in your presentation that it has to take a leadership role. We have had a presentation that talks about two emerging timetables. The first timetable is that between the federal government and the province of Quebec, dealing with those particular issues of an immediate nature, of an urgent nature. The second talks about the timetable of others coming before the committee, talking to us about the expansion of linguistic rights and multicultural rights, recognition of first nation self-government, all as important as the other but certainly two different timetables.

The question I have is to your position dealing with whether there must be a linkage of sorts between these two timetables, that to address one and in fact to solve one without addressing and attempting to solve the other is in

fact a failure, and the role of Ontario must be directed to that area.

M. Tanguay : Premièrement, je vous dis clairement que j'aurais aimé amener une clé avec moi aujourd'hui, une clé de l'avenir de mon pays. L'Ontario possède cette clé qui pourrait permettre la redéfinition de ce beau pays que nous avons. C'est en réponse à la première affirmation que vous avez faite. Je ne le dirai pas assez fort sur les toits : l'Ontario a la clé. Il s'agit que l'Ontario s'en serve.

En fonction de limites de temps, vous parlez de deux sortes de limites de temps : savoir régler les problèmes immédiats et ensuite arriver à compléter, disons, l'ensemble de cette redéfinition de notre pays. Je crois que si l'Ontario et l'ensemble de sa population démontrent vraiment ce leadership et parle au Québec et au restant des citoyens du Canada, en parlant d'une reconnaissance pas tout simplement sur une feuille de papier mais en fonction de valeurs fondamentales qu'il y a depuis le début du Canada alors que nos premiers Européens arrivaient, qu'il y avait deux groupes linguistiques — il faut absolument corriger — je vous préviens, si vous, l'Ontario et le Canada, faites cet exercice, nous sortirons de toutes nos discussions constitutionnelles un pays avec le Québec, partenaire très fort comme les autres provinces. Je vous prédis que le Canada de l'an 2000 sera le plus beau pays au monde.

PEEL MULTICULTURAL COUNCIL

The Vice-Chair: The next group up is the Peel Multicultural Council.

Again, just to remind people that groups are 15 minutes and individuals are five, and if you want the opportunity to have questions asked on your brief, to try to keep it within those 15 minutes. Very good.

Ms Eustaquio: Mr Chairperson, I would like to apologize for the absence of our president, Mrs Savita Junnarkar. Something pressing happened and so she could not be here. My name is Mila Eustaquio. I am the executive director.

The Peel Multicultural Council is the umbrella organization of 65 ethnocultural organizations or agencies involved with multicultural groups and about 100 individuals in the region of Peel.

The mission of the Peel Multicultural Council is to promote a harmonious multicultural society in Peel by increasing communication and by building bridges of understanding between ethnocultural groups, institutions and the community.

In a somewhat similar manner, we see the role of Ontario in Confederation as being similar to that of PMC, and that is of promoting a harmonious multicultural society in Canada by increasing communication and by building bridges of understanding among mainstream or ethnocultural groups; provinces or regions; federal, provincial or municipal governments.

As the multicultural council from one of the fastest-growing and highly diversified regions in Canada, we hereby state: (1) that diversity in cultural, racial, religious and linguistic aspects is a fact of Ontario and Canadian society; (2) that in the interests of preserving Canadian unity, Canadians from sea to sea must be ready to accommodate the specific issues and concerns of various provinces

and regions of the country, whether they be the Atlantic region, Quebec, the north or the western provinces; (3) that his same spirit of accommodation must guide the spirit of tolerance, respect and appreciation of diversity within Ontario; (4) that this diversity in cultural, racial, religious and linguistic aspects can and must be harnessed to provide economic and social benefits to Ontario and Canada; (5) that the rights of Canadians, as described in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, specifically in regard to race, gender, national or ethnic origin, colour or creed, are respected, ensured and are not derogated by any form of legislation; (6) that multiculturalism is not only for the protection and promotion of the non-French and the non-English cultures but also for respecting the contributions of Canadians of British and French origins and for the protection and promotion of their respective cultures; (7) that the principles of democracy, justice and freedom for which most ethnocultural Canadians chose to immigrate to Canada be preserved and promoted regardless of what form of government is established for the federal confederation; (8) that a strong, united Canada is essential for economic and social strategy formulation and implementation; (9) that we support the rights and claims of the aboriginal peoples of Canada, and their right to preserve and promote their cultures and languages, and (10) that equality for all Canadians includes respect for and accommodation of the mentally or physically disabled.

Finally, we in the Peel Multicultural Council wish to state that we are Canadians first and foremost and, as Canadians, we firmly believe that we must strengthen and promote equality for all in order to foster Canadian unity, provide all people with a sense of belonging to a nation, ownership and pride.

With the above-stated principles, we urge the province of Ontario to play a leadership role in the shaping of whatever form of government is negotiated by the various provinces and the federal government.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. As a member from Mississauga, I can surely attest to the tremendous work done by PMC throughout the years. As we all know, Peel is a very dramatically growing community, so the challenges are there and you have certainly met those challenges, which results in a very tolerant, understanding region.

1520

My question to you, Mila, is that right now there is talk about Quebec possibly leaving Confederation or distancing itself. Do you feel that if that happens that would impact on the multicultural fabric of, if not the province of Ontario, certainly the country of Canada? Do you think that would be a threat to the multicultural nature of Canada?

Ms Eustaquio: I am not very sure whether that will happen in the province of Ontario, but my concern is in other provinces where you do not have as many diverse peoples as there are now. Right now, even with Quebec in Confederation, you have all these racist pins in Alberta, you have all this backlash against Orientals in British Columbia, and to a certain extent too even in Ontario you

have all this defacing of the synagogues. Quebec has really been one of the provinces for which Canada is not exactly 100% anglo; it is the force that has been keeping Canada a diversified country and respecting diversity. It might sort of change the whole attitude of the rest of Canada.

Mr F. Wilson: I was really impressed with your presentation here, partly because again you, like several other groups, mentioned the values that seem to transcend all cultural groups. I think you are promoting that we can all aspire to realizing those values.

I was interested, though, in one of your statements about multiculturalism being not only for the protection and promotion of the non-French, non-English, but also for the Canadians of British and French origins. I was just wondering whether you could elaborate a bit on why you thought it necessary to put that in.

Ms Eustaquio: I have been approached several times by specifically the Monarchist League of Canada, saying that: "You know, I don't like multiculturalism. Because of multiculturalism, I feel that our culture is being eroded. I feel that our culture"—meaning the English or the British culture—"is going to be subsumed by all your different cultures." And I said: "No, this is not supposed to be. When you look at multiculturalism, it is not a zero-sum gain, that you lose and I gain. I would look at it more like a win-win situation. By preserving your culture it does not necessarily mean that my culture will be eroded. It is celebrating all of our different cultures together, which is what is so great about this country. If you insist on preserving, for example, the picture of the Queen on stamps, it is not something that in the multicultural community we have anything against. We want to be full partners in this Confederation, we want to be full partners in Canadian society and we want to belong, and by belonging, it doesn't necessarily mean that you are excluded. It's all of us."

Multiculturalism should really not just be for the non-French and non-English; it is for everybody, all Canadians.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

ONTARIO SEPARATE SCHOOL TRUSTEES' ASSOCIATION

The Vice-Chair: Okay, we will go on to the next group—that puts us a little bit ahead of schedule—the Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association. There is Betty Moseley-Williams, the president, from North Bay; Angelo Albanese, first vice-president, from Welland; Roberta Anderson, director, from Ottawa, and Peter Lauwers, the solicitor.

Mr Lauwers: That may be the first time it was ever pronounced correctly the first time, Mr Chair.

The Vice-Chair: Listen, I do get some right.

Mr Harnick: Maybe because you are bilingual.

The Vice-Chair: That is right. I do have an advantage. You can begin.

Mrs Moseley-Williams: I am Betty Moseley-Williams, president of OSSTA. Roberta Anderson is a member of the board of directors of OSSTA, Dr Angelo Albanese is our first vice-president, and of course Peter Lauwers is the solicitor for our association. We have asked him to accompany us because if we get into the very concrete technical

terms of Constitution, we think we might rather have our solicitor speak up for us.

First of all, I would like to tell you who we are. The Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association comprises 54 Roman Catholic separate school boards in Ontario. Thirty eight of our member boards are operating under Bill 75 and have minority language sections. Of these boards, 31 have French-language minority sections and 7 have English-language minority sections. As of May 1990, Roman Catholic separate school boards were educating about 500,000 students in the publicly funded schools in Ontario.

In our brief we try to answer the first question in the discussion paper, "What are the values we share as Canadians?" We make three basic points.

Our first point is about the importance of community in human life. We see the right to community as a basic human right. We see the values of pluralism and multiculturalism in Canada as basic constitutional building blocks which must be maintained.

Our second point is that mainstream culture, while it has its good points, poses a serious threat to community life.

Our third point: As Canadians, we must elevate pluralism and multiculturalism into a transcendent national vision. We believe that all levels of government, including school boards, must articulate and promote that national vision.

I would like to develop the first point about community, and this would be on page 2 of the brief if you are looking for the references. There is an important social balance at the heart of the Constitution which is Canada's social contract. On the one hand, it respects individuals by recognizing their claims to personal autonomy. On the other hand, it respects communities.

OSSTA believes that the co-existence of individual and group or community rights in our Constitution is a part of the genius of the Canadian social contract. It is a recognition that pluralism and multiculturalism cannot survive unless they are sustained by practical measures. Freedom to associate is not sufficient by itself. We believe that this co-existence ought to be preserved, not only because it is part of our tradition but also because it is a reflection of our basic human needs if we are to experience not only life but the good life, and that is the dream of every person.

The need for community is a part of every human being. We see access to community as a matter of basic social justice. The Advisory Committee on Children's Services said that it was the fundamental entitlement of children to have opportunities to participate in their own cultural communities, to profess and practise their own religions and to use their own languages. These are to be provided as part of our collective social responsibility, and we agree.

On to page 4. In everyday life, which is all we have, we need identity and meaning. A community, whether it is identified by cultural, linguistic, religious or other characteristics, has a shared culture which gives identity to its members and helps give meaning to their lives.

One of the problems of talking about community is getting a grip on what it really means for public policy. The fact is that human beings naturally group themselves. It is an ancient behaviour that reflects our need for identity

and meaning, but on a scale that we can understand. What is perhaps unique about our current situation is that for the first time in our history that personal sense of community is under real threat because of the way mainstream culture works. The nurturing aspects of smaller communities are simply not present in modern culture or in very large structures like countries.

OSSTA believes that the signs of the times are not hopeful for the survival of many of Canada's communities. There are three problems. First, there is the overwhelming power of mainstream culture. Second, there is the steadily eroding ability of the family to transmit by itself its particular value system and heritage. Third, there is the ambivalence of society itself about the value of pluralism and group rights. I would now ask Roberta Anderson to continue with our presentation.

1530

Mrs Anderson: Thank you, Betty. No one can deny that there is much that is good in mainstream culture. However, it lacks any true sense of community, because its motivating spirit is individualism. We live in a consumer culture bent on the self-gratification of individuals. Our society in its public face is secular, English-speaking and unrelenting. The power of mainstream culture is evident in its domination of the media and its pervasiveness in society. We believe that mainstream culture threatens communitarian values, minority cultures and languages, religions and any values that can be described as countercultural.

Canadians must not lose access to the sources of human values. I am now addressing page 6 in the brief. Canadian professor Clive Beck cites human biological nature, basic family structure and basic community structure as sources of human values and adds a fourth source, namely, religiocultural tradition. OSSTA believes that maintaining and enhancing the effectiveness of these different sources of human values are basic building blocks in constitutional reform, if we are to preserve the human face of Canada.

The family is the basic unit of community and of society. Despite this foundational status, families in contemporary society have great difficulty in preserving or transmitting a heritage. They need the assistance of a larger community which shares their value system. The traditional family may never have been adequately effective in transmitting a heritage. We need only look at the francophone community and at the native community for examples of the erosion of culture despite the best efforts of family. But today the traditional family is more the exception than the rule. The Children First report has noted that there is a dramatic increase in one-parent families and families in which both parents work outside the home. The amount of continuous contact between parent and child has declined and so has the ability of the family to transmit its heritage.

We are concerned about the increasingly fragile state of families, the stress of modern life and the increasing incidence of both single-parent families and families in which both parents are working. These factors combine to reduce the ability of families to learn and transmit their own cultural, linguistic and religious heritages and to maintain

their sense of community. The result will be assimilation into the mainstream culture.

Because mainstream culture in Canada is so influenced by our neighbour to the south, the American constitutional ideal of individualism has grown in influence. Canadians are losing sight of the importance of nurturing communities and the balance between group and individual rights at the root of our social contract. As you may have noticed in your hearings, that balance is not well understood.

In our brief, we discussed two of the arguments of the individualists who oppose the continuation of group rights. Our best answer to them is in the reasons for supporting community that we have already described. First, there is the strange idea that somehow groups divorce themselves from Canadian society. In reality, no such divorce is possible or desirable. No one wants to create ghettos. Each community contributes its perspective to society as a whole. Every person is a participant in society.

We believe that diversity is good and that homogeneity is bad. Some proponents of the melting pot use the language of individual equality. They argue that individuals are always free to associate for the purposes of preserving and perpetuating their culture, language or religion. The problem with that argument is that the assimilating characteristics of mainstream culture are relentless. In reality, this argument is social Darwinism in different words. In truth, one of the most attractive and civilized features of our Canadian social contract is that we are not forced to make an absolute choice between individual rights and group rights. OSSTA believes that this balance must be maintained. I will now ask Dr Albanese to continue with our presentation.

Dr Albanese: The third part of the presentation deals with the future of Canada. In the third part of our brief we turn to discuss the future of Canada. Reference is page 13.

OSSTA shares the conviction of many that Canada lacks an articulated transcendent national vision. Even though the unique balance among individualism, pluralism and multiculturalism that we enjoy as Canadians draw support from the Constitution, that balance has not been exalted as a civilized national characteristic. We believe that this characteristic amounts to a vision of which Canada can be proud. Our Constitution holds out to each of us the opportunity to experience not only life but the good life, as individuals alone and also as members of communities.

We believe that what is needed is a firm commitment of institutional support to the various communities and groups who make up our social fabric as a nation. We need to glorify our national vision, which reflects respect for not only the freedom and dignity of the individual but also for the pluralistic and multicultural communities in which that individuality finds its deepest personal expression.

The commitment to pluralism and multiculturalism needs to be more than rhetorical. All levels of government, including school boards, have a positive duty to provide the ways and means for implementing our national vision. In the opinion of the Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association, a key institution for the promotion of pluralism and multiculturalism is the school. The successful

transmission of a heritage from generation to generation, be it linguistic, cultural or religious, depends on education.

Dr Watson has made the observation that education is never neutral. Something happens to the students who attend the schools. Recognition of the assimilating influence of majority-language education led to the protection of French-language education rights in Ontario by section 23 of the charter. It led to the Ministry of Education's heritage language program. It also underlies the Roman Catholic separate school system.

As part of the publicly funded system of education in Ontario, the members of OSSTA intend to continue to articulate and promote pluralism and multiculturalism as a part of a transcendent national vision for all Canadians. We believe that all the organs of government have the same duty. Consistent with this vision, we hope that these constitutional discussions result in justice for all.

Mrs Moseley-Williams: The Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association is grateful for the opportunity to participate in this process of constitutional reform. There is one aspect of your work that we want to comment on. Consultation in the form of these hearings is obviously essential. However, there is no concrete focus for the discussion. This means that submissions tend to be general and, we expect, repetitive. It also means that you cannot make full use of the expertise of those addressing you. We urge you to consider the preparation of a white paper setting out proposals for change. That will allow for a more focused, helpful dialogue. Meaningful consultation is an essential ingredient in this enterprise if it is to be successful. We get the impression from reading the press that you have been exposed to some fairly intolerant views. Despite the fact that pluralism and multiculturalism have been national values for a long time, some of our fellow citizens have not accepted them, but we are confident that our and their children will. All that is needed is time and experience.

1540

Finally, we would like to close with an Irish toast, which seems to be most appropriate to your work. May you have the hindsight to know where you have been, the foresight to know where you are going and the insight to know you have gone too far. We thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: We thank you very much for a very interesting presentation. I do have a question, and there is another question from the committee. On page 5 of your brief where you talk about mainstream culture, basically the quote inside there is that, "There is much that is good in mainstream culture, but it lacks any true sense of community or principle, coherence and direction because its ethos is individualism and moral—" A lot of people would argue against that. A lot of the presentations that we have had have argued that by having mainstream culture and only one culture you are able to get more cohesiveness. Can you explain that point a little bit more?

Mr Lauwers: I think our basic position is that community has to occur in smaller groupings, that it is not possible for somebody to identify in a real sense with very large groupings. That is why we pick language and culture, ethnicity, religion as those kinds of smaller, more natural

groupings that occur spontaneously in society. If you eliminate all of them, I do not think you get more cohesiveness; I think you get homogeneity in total, and that is really the essence of the argument here. In fact, the book by Reginald Bibby—you may have gotten some references to that—speaks of that sort of homogenizing influence, flattening out of distinctions among individuals and in society. As a result, people do not have anything to identify with.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for a unique presentation. That certainly is a feather in your cap after we have heard about 500 presentations. This is different because you are really talking about values, but you are talking about them in a pretty specific way in reference to community and family. We have not seen that slant, and I thank you for that. We also, if my memory serves me correctly, have not had a group of trustees before us as such. I think there have been trustees, but they have been part of larger groups.

You said a couple of things I want to ask you to expound a little bit on. I hope you think that we did have some concrete proposals when we went to the people. That was our Changing for the Better document. I see you want us to do something else, and I would like you to say a little bit more about that. When you say you would like a white paper on the proposals for change, are you suggesting that when we make our recommendations you would like to have another go at responding to those recommendations? We have had suggestions that this become a permanent or a standing committee of the Legislature on constitutional reform. Would you like to say a little bit more about what you see?

Mrs Moseley-Williams: Yes, we would like to see a white paper to react to—I do not want to say “react,” to respond to. Our association felt most strongly that we, as members of the education community and of the larger Catholic community, had a great deal to say about the Constitution, that it was us we were talking about and us as part of a large group that we were concerned with. So, I—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You want to respond to our recommendations.

Mrs Moseley-Williams: To a recommendation, yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I hope you can answer this very quickly. You belong to the Catholic school trustees; is this an item on their agenda? Are the school trustees in Quebec making any, what should I say, advances towards the other provinces to get input, to bring people on side, to make this a priority at the annual convention? Could you tell us a little bit about that?

Mr Lauwers: Let me tell you this. I was at a meeting of the Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association in Quebec City, I think it was, last month, and this item came up. I do not know what they decided to do with it, but it is certainly on the agenda. That is as much as I can say, I am afraid.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: If there are results from that discussion at your annual convention, I think they would be very helpful for us, because you are a leadership group. Certainly we ourselves have been challenged to interact with

the province and to encourage others to do that, so I really hope that will be a meaningful discussion for you.

Mrs Anderson: I would just like to add that this brief will be provided to the Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association for its use and will probably appear at the convention in July, and also the fact that schools as an institution play a very key role, because we do culturize children. Whether we do it intentionally or unintentionally we play a very large role in the future of our country.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Hopefully you will make sure that our discussion paper, and if we do produce a white paper, will be distributed throughout your schools and we can get the young people involved in our discussions.

Dr Albanese: Only if we get additional grants.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We provide the copies. Surely you do not charge us money for your opinions. My goodness. That gets very difficult.

Mrs Moseley-Williams: We do thank you and we would certainly make sure our brief will be distributed within Ontario, and we will for certain send it to the Canadian Catholic School Trustees' Association. I can assure you that we will make it part of that discussion so that there can be a reaction. It will be very strong from that group.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

STEVEN KERZNER

The Vice-Chair: We would next like to call Steven Kerzner.

Mr Kerzner: Good afternoon. Thank you for taking the opportunity to hear me or to give me the opportunity to address you. I believe there is much to be said about the nature of the political reforms this country requires, but today I will restrict my comments to what I believe is one of the most centrally important issues facing Ontario and Canada as a whole, an issue, I believe, which has led us to this current state of national malaise.

Let me preface my comments by stating that I believe that significant political changes must emanate from this province. As the province which is truly the engine driving the economy of Canada, Ontario bears a responsibility to this country which is in direct proportion to its contributions.

While these hearings are in fact reactive, I believe that as a result of the testimony brought before you, Ontario must become proactive and begin to deal with one of the root sources of this nation's current problems. The issue I refer to is our system of government. I do not believe, nor do I think that the majority of Canadians believe, in a system which allows a leader to govern as a dictator for four to five years.

Under our current system there exists no legitimate mechanism of checks and balances. This leaves the citizens of this country without the ability to effect change on the policies of the government in power. This has led to the creation of a system whereby the government can and does run out of touch with the people. Public debate has become a moot point and public opinion has been made irrelevant.

Some would suggest that the ability to vote governments out of office during an election represents the ultimate check on government power. I disagree. In the first

place, waiting for as much as five years to vote out a government amounts to the same as looking the door to the hen-house after the fox has already been through. In the second place, in the case of a basically sound government with a few flawed policies, voting the government out amounts to throwing out the baby with the bathwater. I believe that it is time to return control of the government to the people. It is time to institute that which we are currently lacking, which is a participatory democracy.

The institution of a bicameral system with an elected Parliament and an elected Senate, the severing of the monarchy from our political body and the creation of a democratically elected executive branch all would take us further towards a country where the people have a true role in government. These changes must be coupled with the loosening or abolition of party discipline so that elected members of the government can vote with their conscience and in accordance with the views of their constituents. Only then will our elected members become what they are intended to be: representatives of the people rather than the trained seals we see in the legislatures.

Further, I believe that Ontario is a good example of how our political system has failed us. On 6 September 1990, Ontarians, disgusted with the results of the arrogance of the previous government and the years of party discipline which destroyed the ability of members to truly represent their constituents, elected a majority government on a protest vote. We now have a government whose philosophies are, according to a multitude of data, not shared by the majority of Ontarians, but the lack of effective checks in that government's power means that the current government can implement policies which run contrary to public sentiment and which in some cases may hurt this province in the long run. To put it simply, what we have in this country is government by the government for the government, and that must stop.

So I ask you again to be proactive. I ask you to set the ball rolling towards a true participatory democracy in place of our current system of four- and five-year tyrannies.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

Okay, we will return back. We will try again with the people we called a little while ago who were not here, for the last time.

1550

CHRIS VILLINGER

The Vice-Chair: Chris Villinger. Okay. I remind those who we are calling as individuals that they are coming up as individuals under five minutes, and we have a group to go to afterwards, the Association of Ontario Health Centres, just so you know. You have five minutes.

Mr Villinger: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for this opportunity to speak. This committee is an excellent idea and the federal government should be commended for it.

The Vice-Chair: It is provincial.

Mr Villinger: Is this provincial?

The Vice-Chair: Yes, it is.

Mr Villinger: I know you are looking at Ontario right now, but I thought it was federal. Okay, sorry.

The Vice-Chair: Yes, we will take our credit where it is due.

Mr Villinger: As I see it, Quebec is the main cause of disunity in Canada today. They consistently complain and put excessive stresses on the system through their rebelliousness and their self-preoccupation.

They are preventing Canada from being a coherent whole that should focus its resources, ideas and people to achieve new heights of economic prosperity, cultural sophistication and national self-understanding. Their unreasonable demands upon the federal government should be resolved by showing francophones how immoral and unjust their demands are.

Yes, Quebec has the right to self-government; that is the function of its elected MPPs as well as its premiers, mayors and other civil servants. The federal government, however, is the political absolute that is to be adhered to by all provinces, including the province of Quebec. They are entitled to their own cultural direction but must remain within the context of Canada.

Quebec thinks it is very different from the rest of Canada, which is part of the reason for wanting separation. But let's look at our roots. When Canada was first settled over two centuries ago, linguistic, economic and background differences between the two groups of pioneers were real. But the similarities between them were much more significant. All Canadian settlers of that time wanted to build a new home for themselves, survive in a new environment, achieve a working relationship with the natives and create a strong community. Their concerns were also the same. They had to learn how to overcome new physical ailments, grow crops according to new weather patterns, cope with new anxieties and construct some form of social order. It did not matter whether they thought these thoughts in English or in French; what mattered and what matters today is that English and French roots are similar. The styles of conduct might have differed slightly, but the substance of their minds was common. Therefore, Quebecers should look into the past and look around them now to realize that they are our brothers in the Canadian family.

Unlike countries such as Britain, the Soviet Union, or the United States for that matter, where the federal government is the only absolute, Canada encourages one's heritage to be his reference point as well. Quebec wants independence. Well, is that not independence? Provincial governments are elected by the people of that province. Is that not independence? Quebec has its independence and need not fight for it any more, just as all provinces have the appropriate amount of power to further their provincial interests without disrupting national unity.

Does Quebec think it is being treated unfairly? I think it is being favoured over the rest of Canada. Politicians of every generation have had to appease Quebec to maintain Canadian unity. Quebec should re-evaluate its adolescent disposition towards the federal government as well as its personal hubris. This done, Quebec will realize its proper place in Canada. After all, they are one of the original founders of Confederation.

Sirs, what I would ask of you is this: To convince Quebec to remain a part of the Canadian family where it

belongs, and to treat Quebec as an equal. Equality to me means keeping the balance of power between the provinces by not giving or withholding additional powers without doing the same for the other provinces. Personally, the level of provincial power compared to federal power I think is in proper measure. Federalism plus industrial privatization equals domestic and international success.

I also suggest increasing the number of compulsory credits in Canadian history from one to two. Increasing student exchanges between the provinces would also be an effective way of achieving mutual understanding and respect between the regions. If student exchange programs are not workable, then perhaps funding for additional inter-provincial field trips is required.

I think we should also be self-indulgent and try to become exhibitionists in the media. Reliance upon American programs confuses our own culture. Perhaps large incentives to Canadian movie production companies to produce more Canadian material would yield a great cultural return for little investment. For example, making the Canadian awards for visual and auditory arts more prestigious, I think, is an obvious incentive. Production of material that dramatizes the Canadian experience as it was, is and will be, would enhance the feeling of being Canadian. Use of the media by politicians to express their political, philosophical and personal views, I think, is on the upswing and will hopefully continue to grow. I think mailing of a copy of the Canadian Constitution and the Charter of Rights to every Canadian citizen would be wise.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you. I hope Quebec remains a part of Canada because I think it is a major player in Canada.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much.

KEN KAFIEN

The Vice-Chair: Okay. Ken Kafien.

Mr Kafien: I regret having to waste my five minutes rebutting the ignorance of antibilingual groups, but here goes. One of the basic myths that antibilingual groups like to try to perpetuate in order to justify their stance is that bilingualism somehow infringes on people's rights. What a bizarre statement. The fact is that having bilingual services gives back infinitely more rights than it takes; if indeed it takes away any at all is a good question. Some say that it is discriminatory, but how is it discriminatory?

Some government jobs require you to speak to French-speaking Canadians as well as English-speaking Canadians. If you are a welder, you have to learn how to weld. If you are a cook, you have to learn how to cook. It is only the most basic kind of common sense that tells us that bilingual jobs require bilingual individuals. "Discriminatory" is hogwash. There are a few unfortunate cases where people were denied or delayed promotion because they lacked the necessary skills, but no one stops them from learning that skill. The fact is that for every one of those cases, there are 500 French-speaking Canadians whose lives have been made easier and their rights restored because of it. Whom shall we impose on, the 540,000 Franco-Ontarians or, what, the 2,000 or 3,000 civil servants?

Bill 8 did not inconvenience me or anyone I know, or anyone they knew. I ask everyone who would seek to eradicate French services and bilingualism, has it really offended you so deeply, or at all for that matter? Has it changed your life? How many times a day do you have to make some adjustment because of it? Hardly ever for me.

Sometimes I have seen people come before this commission with impassioned pleas, bitterly against bilingualism, spit flying from their mouths, as it is from mine right now. I find myself giggling because I know, and I think the committee knows, that their attempts to incite people to an antibilingual or anti-French stance are transparent. If half of the things that they implied were true, you would wonder why there were not people rioting in the streets. For example, a typical tactic they use is to give you figures on the cost of bilingualism or they will describe it as a "staggering cost." But it is easy to understand why they will not tell you that the bilingual programs in this country account for only 1/200 of the budgetary spending, or 0.5%. As one gentleman said in an earlier session, the numbers just are not there to prove it. So more needs to be done to ensure that people have access to information.

Another myth is that bilingualism is a threat to our national unity. That is a very startling contradiction. The only possible way to explain such a ridiculous statement is that they did not mean it that way. Perhaps what they meant is that the ghettoism of French and English divides us. If you take away bilingualism and end up with English for here and French for there, the two peoples eventually stop talking to each other because they do not have the ability any more. They stop sharing their opinions, they stop sharing their ideas, idealisms, beliefs, values, customs and then the big one, their loyalties.

The peoples change because they can no longer get together and talk any more. One people develops one way of doing things, the other another way. One people develops one way of thinking, the other people develops another way of thinking, until eventually we no longer have anything in common any more and so we split. The real threat to national unity are those who are oversensitive and those who choose to be annoyed by our diversity and choose to complain unjustifiably. The real threat are those who purposely choose the most inopportune times to stamp on flags and to declare unilingualism in the name of outdated principles.

1600

Regarding referenda, I do not believe that you can or even should try to run a country by referendum. They are useful from time to time but not on all matters. However, if antibilingual groups insist, then I am sure the Franco-Ontarian community would be happy to oblige.

I got this from the Commissioner of Official Languages' report from 1989. A nationwide Gallup poll conducted in September 1989 asked citizens whether their province ought to recognize English and French as official languages in order to provide provincial services in both languages. The question, the same as one asked in a similar Gallup poll in 1987, is a strong one, proposing official recognition of English and French as prerequisites to bilingual services. A softer question really asking about the

provision of bilingual services without official recognition might have elicited an even more positive response. In 1987 in Ontario, 49% approved of declaring Ontario officially bilingual. In 1989, 53% approved of official bilingualism for Ontario. At best, antibilingual groups could have expected a near loss, according to this survey. Surveys can be somewhat unreliable, but I do not think that a win for a unilingual Ontario would be such a decisive one as a lot of them would like to suggest.

Another myth is that Quebecers are anti-English. In 1989, 81% of Quebecers believed that English should be a mandatory subject taught in school. Now, they passed Bill 101 and Bill 178. Those were monster bills, and it was very ugly, I admit. Half of me wishes that they did not pass them, but at the same time I realize that Quebec does not have the luxury that we have of being able to take its language for granted. To feel their feelings involves the ability of being able to project yourself into their vantage point and see it as they do. Some will not or cannot do that.

The question then becomes: Do you have the ability to see beyond the narrow-mindedness and shallowness of an outdated principle of, "We should all be treated equally"? Tell that to a person in a wheelchair, for example.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, I would ask you to sum up. You have gone over the five minutes, and I will give you a couple of seconds to sum up. I realize that you have got a lot there that you have written and it is interesting.

Mr Kafien: I have just a paragraph.

You cannot treat unequal things as though they were equal. That is not fair. Every indication shows that without special steps, the anglicization of Quebec would continue. You cannot deny that Quebec is outnumbered in North America something like 40 to one. They have good reason to worry. Without special measures, eventually Quebec would be just nobody special, just one of the North American crowd. Canada would also then become just one of the North American crowd. Our most obvious difference from the US would be gone or diminished and we would essentially become Americans. That would suit some people just fine, but I strongly believe that Canada should be run by those who wish to be Canadians. In what direction would we go by weakening our French tradition? The APEC model of Canada. Incidentally, APEC stands for the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada, as if English is an endangered species in North America. It is 40 to one, remember? Quebec is a distinct society.

Finally, the principle of equal treatment has its place, but it is only a guideline. The day we become slaves to our principles is the day that we lose our humanity and our ability to use reason. That day will without doubt mark the end of a united, strong and wondrous land called Canada.

The Vice-Chair: I thank you very much. Can we ask you to leave a copy of your brief with the clerk? We did not get a copy.

Mr Kafien: I will get a photocopy, and I will bring it.

The Vice-Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

JOHN COPPING

The Vice-Chair: Next we would call on John Copping.

Mr Copping: I would just like to say I am sorry I was not here when I was called. I was given a time yesterday and I showed up a few minutes before that time.

I came to last night's session hoping to get an opportunity to speak. At the end of the evening, it was clear that there were not enough spots and I was told that I could get an opportunity if I came back today. This inconvenience turned out to be kind of a blessing because it showed me something I never expected to see. I thought that when I came here there would be people of all ages and temperaments jostling for space and making sound arguments and unsound arguments. Well, it was crowded and there were all kinds of different opinions being disseminated, but I was very disappointed to see how few young people had showed up and even more dismayed when only two of them got up to speak.

One of them, I think his name was David Lui, got up and he spoke in a very terse, hard way about trashing the party system and rebuilding the government. He was the closest thing that Canadians can come to having an angry young man. He was raging, but what made me angry was that a lot of the people in the audience were fidgeting and grumbling with what he was saying. I guess they found it very shocking. Now this audience was made up almost entirely of people in their middle ages and people in their retirement ages and they just seemed to have forgotten that young people who say outrageous things are the only chance that this country or any country has for a future. They are also the ones who have to pay for our mistakes.

Today I feel very sorry for any invalid or hermit who has to stay inside and rely on the press and the electronic media to learn what is happening in our country. On the surface things seem to be very dire. The cover of a weekly news magazine has announced that Canadians have two years to decide the fate of their country. A newspaper editorial says that our national identity is threatened. I get the feeling that I am supposed to feel very worried about something and that from one end of the country to the other Canadians feel bitter, alienated and deceived. But a lot of the details are missing. I have not found any mention of how this trouble began or when it began or even exactly what the trouble is. Every time I read a newspaper I learn that the Canada we live in is no longer adequate and for some reason we need a new one. I keep wishing that someone would stop ringing the alarm bell and explain where the fire is. A few weeks ago the Prime Minister was heard to make the rather ominous pronouncement that Canada needed to be restructured and that he was the man to lead the fight. I personally would not let him change my oil, much less restructure my country, but it brings up an interesting question.

Normally, a crisis in the community is reported by the media after it occurs in the community and it is addressed in some way by the government. What kind of crisis is it that first appears in the halls of government, then is reported by the media in the hopes that the community gets wind of it? I would be surprised if a large segment of this community or any community in Canada had even heard of the constitutional crisis. You only need to walk down Spadina Avenue or Finch Avenue or Parliament Street to

see what kind of crisis the people are having. Their crisis has to do with living with the effects of a recession, broad taxation and assistance cuts. I think you will find that the intricacies of constitutional debate are largely lost on these people, and this is the general public that I am talking about.

I think that the urgent problems have very little to do with constitutional crisis and nothing to do with national unity or identity. The only new problem under the sun is simply this, if you will forgive my metaphor: There is an ever-widening gulf in our country. On one side of the gulf there is a population grappling with increasingly harsh economic realities. On the far shore is an overbuilt edifice of bureaucrats and policymakers who, for all I know, still think of themselves as leaders, and foundering around in the water in between are chronically uncritical news media which have not got enough gas to make it to one side or the other.

I think a gathering like this is a good example of our provincial government trying to narrow this gulf. I know you have all been working hard and you have heard a lot of stuff, but I think the absence of young people and of working people from last night's session indicated really how a lot of people in Ontario just are not concerned about Meech Lake or the language issue or any of these other really quite nebulous problems that we are repeatedly told we have to deal with. People are far too busy paying their bills and staying alive in a province where the government cannot help its people, in a country where the government does not know who its people are.

I am a self-employed person, so I was able to come here this afternoon, but I waited for four hours to get a space. I am the exception, not the rule.

The situation in Quebec, from my experience, is not very different. I have lived in Quebec as well as Ontario, and I can say from personal experience that your average Québécois has not really the slightest idea what the rest of the country thinks about the province of Quebec, and really they could not care less. The passionate desire for special powers and special status felt by Quebec politicians is not, I think, shared by the general population of that province.

The temptation is to say that people are tuned out and they do not care about the government and they do not care about policy-making. I think that really the absolute reverse is true, and I mean that in every sense of the word. I think it is time that the politicians, editors and pollsters try asking us what we are about instead of simply telling us. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: I want to thank you very much. Sorry about the four-hour wait. We did get you on the agenda.

1610

ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO HEALTH CENTRES

The Vice-Chair: Next we would like to call the Association of Ontario Health Centres; Michael Quinn, the development officer. We see somebody else coming, if you can identify yourself.

Mr Armstrong: My name is Robert Armstrong. I am counsel on behalf of the Association of Ontario Health Centres. I am a lawyer with one of the Ontario community legal clinics, York Community Services, and I am here today representing the Association of Ontario Health Centres. Michael Quinn is with the association and is here representing them.

We would like to extend our appreciation to the committee for inviting the association to come and speak on a somewhat complicated topic, I think, the question of constitutional division of powers, health services and refugees. Because of some of the work that the association has recently done, it really seems quite appropriate that we do speak on a topic like this. You will see in the brief—and I know that you have just received it and you have been on the move and getting all kinds of materials—but you will see in schedules IV, V and VI the motion that the Association of Ontario Health Centres passed in 1990 concerning the refugee situation and specifically the backlog; the letter to the Minister of Employment and Immigration and her response in February.

So there has been advocacy by the Association of Ontario Health Centres already on this point and this is an opportunity that we are pleased to be able to take to move a little bit further into the issue. The Association of Ontario Health Centres is composed of 58 organizations in Ontario; 36 are community health centres with community boards; 22 are health service organizations, which are often various types of associations of doctors. Some do have community boards as well.

I would like to refer you if I could initially to page 2 of the brief where we tried to set in a sort of executive summary form what the brief is about. Our submission is related to the constitutional issues that we see arising in the health services field. We are going to use throughout the brief the concrete example of the convention refugee claimants who have come to Canada to seek protection from persecution in their home countries and who have made claims in Canada before 1 January 1989. They are known popularly as the backlog claimants.

We are using them because, as we look through the system and look at the constitutional issues, they tend to make a good concrete case to look at, and that is usually helpful especially if we are dealing with something like constitutional law. Our submission fundamentally, as set out on page 2, is that the health system in Ontario is being faced with a problem and being forced to deal with that problem as it wishes to do and as our members wish to do. But the root of the problem arises at the federal level and in fact there is virtually nothing that seems to be able to be done from the provincial side to stop the root cause which is giving rise to the problem that we at the provincial level have to deal with in the health services field.

I would like to make five points. Four of them arise out of the brief and the fifth one is a supplementary one that follows on it.

The first point deals with the backlog claimants themselves. Who are the backlog claimants? As you are aware, 1 January 1989 Canada brought in a new system for the determination of refugees. At that time there was a freeze

put on people who had been in the system prior to 1 January 1989: They were not going to be allowed access to this new system immediately. One of the consequences of this was, of course, people who came in on 1 January 1989 and afterwards are now landed, while people in the backlog are still sitting. If you look at schedule I of the brief, this is a federal government document which shows the way in which the backlog program itself slowly came on after the first new system was up and running. The backlog claimants have been estimated at 1 January 1989 to be 85,000 cases or 100,000 cases, depending on who you talk to. In any event, it is a large number of people.

If you look at the brief and schedule VI, which is the recent letter responding to the Association of Ontario Health Centres from Minister of Employment and Immigration Barbara McDougall, on page 2 she admits: "At the end of November 1990, 57% of the estimated 85,000 cases were opened and 39% decided."

We are talking about 120,000 people here with a program that was commenced on 1 January 1989, originally envisioned to have cleared out the backlog in two years, revised to September 1991. Mr Fairweather says there is no way for 1991, and the parliamentary standing committee on labour, employment and immigration, at an earlier stage, said it would take six years at least to clear the backlog at the rate that it was going at the time that it gave the report.

The second point deals with the backlog again. Why are we bringing to you the issue of the backlog? The issue is human suffering. The Association of Ontario Health Centres, as you know, is targeted somewhat towards serving low-income individuals, and since claimants usually come only with their claim and little else, they often are attracted to seeking health services at the community clinics or at the health service organizations. So we are seeing this face of human suffering day after day among residents of Ontario who our primary health care workers are seeing.

What kind of health do these people have? The issue is not so much what the health was that they brought with them; the issue is what has happened to their health since they arrived in Canada, where they are seeking protection. The answer is clear: The health is deteriorating.

If I can point you to page 4 of the brief, what often happens is that we get contact with these people because there is an immigration medical that has to be filled out. Often the claimant will come initially for the medical but subsequently may in fact form an attachment with the clinic and then have that clinic or those particular doctors act on an ongoing basis. That is the source of some of our experience.

If we look at page 13 of the brief, there were two studies that were done, one by the Inter-Church Committee for Refugees, which has been noted in the press recently, and one that has not had so much play, which is a Quebec study on refugees in the greater Montreal area. I have attached that as a schedule as well for you.

On page 13 of our brief we set out the kinds of things that are being seen by our members here in Ontario, by the ICCR study which was carried out and by the Montreal study. Of backlog claimants surveyed, 58% claimed that

their symptoms had become worse since coming to Canada. These symptoms are ones that are in the textbooks that were used in terms of developing the kinds of surveys that were done: concern for family safety 76%; very tense and nervous 72%; depression; spontaneous thoughts of their country repeatedly coming into their mind; irritability or angry outbursts; loneliness; sleeplessness; brooding about their problems; restlessness; inability to concentrate; headaches and stomach pain.

A further symptom on the list was called suicidal feelings or thoughts. Although it was the least identified symptom when the list of symptoms were presented to the claimants, it is very instructive to analyse how these broke down. When we looked at the backlog claimants that identified this symptom and matched them against other claimants in the group who were as long-staying as they had been, some dramatic figures came out.

If they had been in Canada two years, of the two-year group, 19% identified this symptom. But by the time we get to claimants who are five years or over, that percentage has jumped to 63%. It should be noted that right now people in the backlog have at least been here for two years and some have been here for four to six years and they have seen other people go ahead of them in the new system.

1620

The study by ICCR notes, "Given the fact that the present backlog process does not allow for virtually anyone to be reunited with their family in less than four years, unless a remedy is found quickly we have a time bomb waiting to explode on our hands." The Montreal research report, which is appended, states: "For refugees, on a short-term basis, this situation creates a situation of psychological distress that is manifested by symptoms of anxiety and depression and represents intense suffering....A coherent social and humanitarian position is obvious; it is more urgent than ever not to allow the situation to deteriorate any further."

So this is what we are faced with, and the question becomes: How does this relate to constitutional law? We would like to point out that we are dealing with two separate fields. Health services, to a greater degree, is provincial; immigration is federal. But we have to ask a question: How can it be that a federal system can be implemented that is absolutely impervious to provincial influence—or influence from anyone, as far as I am concerned—that lays on the doorstep of the province the suffering that arises out of that system? We are asked to put Band-Aids on symptoms in health care services in Ontario, and yet we cannot help the client the way we are trying to help, as medical people, in terms of trying to get at the root cause, because there is a constitutional chasm that simply seems to be unbridgeable. It seems to the association that something is definitely wrong in a situation like that, where there is such a direct, concrete effect on a provincial area of jurisdiction by a federal institution.

I would also like to note, and this could be checked with the Ministry of Treasury and Economics, that in terms of federal money that comes to Ontario, it is my understanding that claimants are excluded from the calculation of the entitlement of Ontario when the per capita grant is

calculated. So if we assume that Ontario has one half of the backlog claimants who are still here, which would probably be around 20,000 or something, plus it has approximately 40% to 50% of new claimants who are coming in, who are also excluded and they are coming in now at 36,000 a year, if we say that 40% of that is coming into Ontario, if the per capita grant in terms of figuring out the entitlement is approximately \$757 and we multiply that by the number of claimants in Ontario, that is money that Ontario does not get, and yet our services are to be available, under the international agreement, to these people.

They are entitled to welfare; they are entitled to work in the backlog. If they cannot work, they are entitled to welfare. They are entitled to health services, and this is part of supporting a claimant, because we say: "Come to Canada and make your claim, if you're seeking protection from persecution, and we will support you until your claim is decided. If you are found not to be a claimant, you return, unless there is some other basis that you can stay in Canada." But one would have to ask, how can this be that there is no calculation within the formula, that Ontario gets no money and yet has the obligation to provide the service? Again, where is the constitutional chasm being bridged? Where is co-operative federalism that is so touted? As a matter of fact, I would ask this committee, where is confrontational federalism? Why is it left to the municipalities to squawk, because they are the ones that are bearing the burden of the welfare administration? So I think there needs to be a clear look at the division of powers in this particular area where we have such a concrete example.

The fourth point that I want to make is also a constitutional point and it is in our brief as well. That deals with the general question of the division between province and federal government with respect to health services. There has been quite a bit that has been done, especially as a result of the budget, in analysing where the national health system is going.

The association comes down clearly on the side that there must be national standards. The association is clearly worried by the capping that is going on and the freezing of the escalators and the reducing cash grants that will be coming to Ontario, because there will be, at some point, no control with respect to health moneys. The federal government can say, "Oh, don't worry; we'll take away some other money." I ask the provincial government, "What does that do to your trying to figure out what envelopes are important and which departments should be getting how much money?" So, "If you are not co-operating in health, what we are going to do is take it away from you from someplace else." How are you going to keep your house in order without losing funds? It is a double whammy, because if you take the money away from someplace else in order to put it into health, you are skewering some other area.

The federal government may say, "Well, don't worry, we can maintain the national standards because we still have a stick." My question is: Is this the way a federation should function? I think that is the issue that the association is raising. Surely this has to be rethought a little bit.

Finally, the last point that I will make—I think we are running out of time; this is not in the brief—is that if one considers that the regular claimants who are coming into Canada after 1 January 1989 are coming in high percentage to Ontario and already, if I can quote the statistics that I believe are applicable, the time length originally projected for an initial hearing for new claimants, when they just get what is called their credible basis hearing—two to four months was what we were told in December 1988. The reality in December 1990 is 10 months, average.

After you get past the credible basis, then you have to prove that you really are a refugee before the full hearing. What is the time length for a full hearing for somebody under the new system? Not the backlog but the new people who are coming in: Ontario, 7 months; Quebec and Atlantic Canada, 3 months. So if you look at Ontario, we are now talking 17 months at minimum for new claimants—as the press said, popularly now called the frontlog.

If people who have been here from two to six years, are suffering in the backlog, and the new claimants are now here looking at maybe two years down the road or worse, I ask you, when will we start seeing these symptoms on the backlog in the frontlog? That is exactly on our provincial health service's doorstep. Those are people who are coming to our clinics and we are being asked to serve them.

So I again ask you on behalf of the association to clearly look at the question of whether there should be some influence of the provincial government in a area of federal jurisdiction which impacts so directly, and second, to protect the national health care system but to look at the way that that is done and whether that should be done by a federal stick, or whether that should be done by provincial and federal co-operation.

The association does not at this time have a presentation to present on those constitutional options, but I can tell you now that there are community health centres that are today discussing those very principles in a second brief. Now, whether those will surface and the extent and quality of those briefs, we do not know, but I can tell you that we are concerned and we would ask you to be concerned that there be some principles developed as to how overlapping jurisdictions should be developed in a new Canada.

Those are our submissions.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much. We have gone over by a couple of minutes. I will allow one question if it is a very quick one with a very short reply. I will be nice today; it is Friday.

Mr Offer: A very short one: In terms of the relationship that you have brought forward dealing with the backlog and the resultant health problems, do you feel that those would be minimized if those claiming refugee status were be given an immediate work permit?

Mr Armstrong: People in the backlog have had the right to work since 1 January 1989, so they are not at issue on that point. However, it is true, and it is not a position of the association but it is the position of many other refugee- and immigrant-assisting groups, that it is absolutely ludicrous to have new system claimants come in and not be

ble to work until they have gone to the credible basis when we have now a 10-month wait and these people are ready to work and are willing to work and would be willing to compete.

So I think your point is well taken, that they could be contributing, productive members of Canadian society whether they go home or whether they stay. When one looks at the acceptance rates of 70% acceptance in the backlog and something like 81% in the new system, one has to ask, how many future Canadians are we putting through this health wringer, and what are we going to have to do in future for these Canadians who are going to not only be permanent residents but who are taking out Canadian citizenship as one of our workers did the other day?

So we are looking down the road and we have to ask questions. These are future Canadians whom we are talking about. These are not abusers the way the press and the government sometimes puts it. We are talking about 8 out of 10 being future Canadians here. What kind of system are we operating? And I think the provincial government is every right, regardless of whether it is dollar-for-dollar reimbursement because they are out-of-province people or welfare, to say, "What in the world is going on here?" to the federal government and to put pressure on that this system has to be changed.

There are lots of recommendations out there from refugees and immigrant groups about how those systems can be changed to be improved.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much for your short answer.

Mr Armstrong: I apologize.

The Vice-Chair: I should know better than to do that.

Mr Armstrong: As you can see, it is somewhat of a topic for the AOHG and somewhat of a topic for myself. Thank you very much for an opportunity for us to appear.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you.

D. K. CAMPBELL

The Vice-Chair: We would like to call up Captain D. K. Campbell from the Coffee House News.

Mr Campbell: I am Captain Campbell, Mr Chairman.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, excuse me, sir, could I ask you to sit down.

Mr Campbell: That is all right, I am going to sit down eventually.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you.

Mr Campbell: I am Captain Campbell. I would hope that the MLAs would pass on to Mr Philip and Mr Hampson the fact that I was convicted on 29 January for speeding and my case is due on 27 March, as number one evidence that we are an Alice-in-Wonderland government. I will just read my summation, as further evidence that the NDP government is a capitalist government and that obviously the MLAs in front of me are capitalists and that we are in an Alice-in-Wonderland world.

We need one country; one flag; one language; one level of development; one government with municipal govern-

ments for details; a non-divisive economic system—that is, public ownership of our industries; the separation of church and state, no public support for a religious person or organization; unpacked, unbought nomination meetings, meetings based not on the lunatic noises of the 1989 NDP convention recognized leadership candidates but on the knowledge of Canada and the world, and public records of attempts to change our lunatic economic system to public ownership; young persons in grade 1 learning of our laws and respect of said or suffering from adult consequences—and I hope you got that; that is in reference to the Young Offenders Act. A lot of this will be over your heads, but you can read it over after—zero population, not the lunatic actions of the United States Mafia and its control of Quebec—that is, the offering of \$6,000 for the production of more problems in a nuclearized-bound world.

We need media sanity, honesty, not silly continued lies; for example, "The Cold War is over." Our child leader—you know our child leader, eh?—she is called McLaughlin. She said at the NDP convention, "Hallelujah, the war is over; communism is dead." Well, so much for childishness; an arts council that supports realist, sane, honest, anticapitalist, antireligious, antiescapist writers, composers, ending the Jewish Mafia-Hollywood agreement that Canada may produce no films so long as Hollywood from time to time mentions the word "Canada" in its escapist works. Maybe you do not know about this agreement, but it has been around for a few years and it has got to go in the garbage can. It is the reason why Canadian film producers cannot get distribution of their films, the argument being as long as they mention the film that was done in North Bay, as you well know.

An Ontario government must stop and eliminate any more baloney—I call them baloney and you, if you are NDP, I hope you call them baloney too—division and giveaway of Canada to the United States and world capitalists. We have got about 15 years, give or take 20 years, before Japan and Germany—if you have been around for a few years; I see a woman smiling there, we have been over this road before, a few of us who are a few years old—get themselves armed enough. This Persian Gulf deal is just a little sideshow deal, a Gadhafi deal. It is simply flexing the muscles. On 6 August 1945, the United States told the Soviet Union, "Look, shut up, or else we're going to drop the bomb." And we all know about General MacArthur, or we should know about that.

This is my position, that we have these silly nomination meetings where guys are being appointed who have not got a clue. We got an example of a Greek MP who did not know where Ottawa was until he was appointed. Now, this nonsense has to end, the packing of nomination meetings. I do not have to tell you, I stood for Eglinton-Lawrence for the NDP and I got my wife's vote and my own vote.

I want to end my contribution by saying I have done my duty. One might ask the question, "Why don't you stick your head in the sand?" Well, that is not Douglas Campbell. I do not think you have ever heard of the great Canadian who is talking to you.

We did have another great—not a Canadian, but nevertheless a great person in the Legislature. His name was Ed

Ziemba. He went to jail for his convictions. Stephen Lewis, another little child, came along to the Don jail, the warden's tour, you know, and I was picketing the jail in protest against Ziemba's—along with a reasonably good man by the name of Morty Shulman, another boy that Stephen Lewis rapped the knuckles of. I said: "Look, Stephen, why don't you carry a sign? Do something useful." All he did was smile at me and walked away. Meanwhile, Ziemba was proving that he was a man of conviction. Not a Canadian, but certainly a great person in Canada.

This is the calibre of people that we need, but on the contrary we are electing, we are appointing people who are jokes. Now, I may for the fun of it stand for the reeve of Howland township. You never heard of that. That is Manitoulin Island. A Conservative stood there, and he was the most honest candidate, against the NDP candidate. The NDP candidate says, "We don't want nuclear weapons here, but maybe the Hydro will build them some place else." Well, she just killed herself. The Conservative on the contrary said that he was against a nuclear plant on the north channel, but he would support a hydroelectric one. Second best would be a coal one. Of course, Mr Brown—you know Mr Brown—said basically he would support a nuclear plant.

What I want to say is, I can bury myself with a lot of other people, but you are going to wind up like Pastor Niemöller. I am sure you know Pastor Niemöller, his famous statement after the Communists were eliminated and after the Socialists supported the Nazi Party, as the NDP are doing in Ontario. You must remember that Bobby Rae offered the eight Senate seats of Ontario, supported Meech Lake, went to the NDP convention in 1989 and did not support my motion that was carried at the convention against existing and potential nuclear plants. Instead, what did he say? "We are going to freeze."

Now, this is exactly why the Liberals and Conservatives were put out of office, if you be a Liberal, because the workers have got tired of double-cross, double-cross, double-cross. The first thing our young friend, who had gone down to Washington to get down on his knees to the United States capital, said, "Well, you know, you do not have to worry about the revolution in Ontario because it is not going to happen, and meanwhile we are authorizing the sale of Bronfmans and consumer utilities." The CCF has been on record from its beginning to take over public utilities, and what does the NDP government do? The first thing it does, it sells a public utility, or agrees to it. This is a double-cross and it is going to take place to the extent that in 15 or 20 years, when Germany and Japan are strong enough, they are going to nuclearize the United States. It is called capitalism.

You have to tell Audrey McLaughlin that because she thinks that the cold war is over and that communism is dead. No, unfortunately the Douglas Campbells are not dead and I hope they never are if we are going to save this planet. And it is not due to the film, although Caldicott has to be credited, if You Love This Planet.

I want to know now what you capitalists are going to do, because I have done my duty. How are you as capitalists going to stop a Japan, a Germany, a United States capitalist

takeover of Canada? Call it tricontinentalism, which has been on stream for 40 years. And you know that good man Eric Kierans, one of the first guys to mess up the post office, but when he is on with a child called Stephen Lewis and Dalton Camp, he makes them both look like children because he is more and more every day mentioning tricontinentalism without using the words. The word now is "trilateral," okay? But make no mistake, we are heading into a takeover by those three—I do not mean countries. We are talking now of Krupp, Dupont, Mitsubishi, the old boys. Throw in the Reichmanns and the Bronfmans and what have you, if you like, but that is what we are heading into. And the "distinct society," the Senate business, the division of Canada, Oka, are all manipulated by capitalists. The Mafia controls Quebec; has since the 1930s.

1640

I do not have to tell you about Hal Banks. He beat in my head back in 1949. He was brought here by the CCF, by the Roman Catholic church, by the Liberal Party, to eliminate the Canadian Seamen's Union and every union that opened its mouth after the war, because we made a declaration not to hit the Brits during the war and we kept Britain alive. And what did we have? The scum that was brought in here from the United States, the Mafia, and they got together with their friends in Quebec who controlled Quebec, and this is what we are faced with, a continued division of this country. I repeat, Oka was produced. It is all part of the vision.

Greater provinces: I just finished hearing the chiefs there, one from Parry Sound, Manitoulin Island where my ancestors—half the island is Campbell; the other half does not know it. Fortunately the chiefs there have decided that they get together and make peace with the municipalities except for one, Wikwemikong. They want all the island—they are like the Haida out in BC, he wants all of Canada well, 85% of Canada—because their argument is, as you well know, you have heard it probably, that Manitoulin produced them on this part of the planet; unlike us because we are immigrants, you see. We came from another country, but they were produced here.

So I want to know from you capitalists how you are going to stop a capitalist takeover of Canada. Mr Wilson how are you going to do it?

Mr G. Wilson: We ask the questions here, do not forget.

Mr Campbell: I was in the other room and one of the briefers asked a question. It was not at my level, but how are you going to stop it?

The Vice-Chair: This point here is that basically we are being very lenient in regard to the presentations and we are doing that for a reason, which is that we want to give people full opportunity to express their views. I think at this point I would say that you have a very interesting description of history in the past and you mentioned you come from Manitoulin.

Mr Campbell: Well, my ancestry actually started in the Toronto area but they migrated progressively north and west. I have been here since 1840.

The Vice-Chair: Anyway, we will allow you to sum up. You have a couple of minutes. It is your two minutes, or whatever way you want to use it.

Mr Campbell: I am reminded of the Indians next door. It was good for a laugh, you know. You would have got a laugh out of your NDPers. Apparently Mr Rogers from Parry Sound—he said God's country—came down to speak to the NDP convention but he was told that he had to be a member of the party and he put forward the argument that therefore this was another attempt to suppress Mr Bisson, however it is pronounced. You got the reference that I am in the Indian category, I am being suppressed, because other guys are going to have to deal with this question and the workers are quite convinced—it does not matter whether I come down here. I just finished a North York senior's meeting and I am bringing their argument also.

They are convinced that it does not matter whether we speak to you or not, that you already made up your mind to give Ontario to the United States. But I want to make reference, though, because I believe I was allotted 15 minutes and I started at 4:30.

The Vice-Chair: Oh, yes.

Mr Campbell: I was scheduled at 4 o'clock but because I am little bit more efficient than the long-winded people—in other words, I am looking at the mountains, not the molehills of whether we should have "ramps" in our Constitution. In the next room there was a handicap association calling for "ramps" to be put into the Constitution. Do you understand me? A capitalist document, therefore a series of lies, at our expense. Probably hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on this rubbish. Not a bit of truth in it. That is the type of rubbish that is going to turn the NDP out. As Bob Rae said, "We have to get the respect of the workers." How in the H can you, when you put out rubbish like that?

Clearly what he should have done, and what the people of this world have to say is, do we love this planet? Are we going to put capitalism in the garbage can, including Audrey MacLaughlin, who said at the NDP convention that in the 1960s she was involved with her family. In other words, she was not carrying a ban-the-bomb sign and therefore evidence that about the only thing she could leave maybe is the route to the backhouse. That is about the extent of her knowledge of Canada.

What I am saying is that we have to have knowledgeable people. We cannot change this country if in fact the country is made up of, with all due respect to Mr Carrozza here, who has a feeble knowledge of Canada—

Clerk of the Committee: I have a very good knowledge.

Mr Campbell: I must say that if he had—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, at this point—

Mr Campbell: —maybe 40 years of experience in this country—

The Vice-Chair: Time is up. Just hold it one second.

Mr Campbell: I have still got—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, the point is, we allowed you very much room in order to express your views, no matter

how colourful they were. When you start getting to the point of getting personal—

Mr Campbell: I am entitled to point out that you—

The Vice-Chair: We are at this point.

Mr Campbell: —stand for office, and I would submit—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, and rightfully so. Democracy works well, and you only got two votes, sir.

Mr Campbell: And you are submitting, on the contrary, that anybody can stand. A person can get up and say such nonsense, "The cold war is over," and is qualified to stand as a candidate in Canada.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, your time is over. Thank you very much for your time.

Mr Campbell: You guys have got 15 or 20 years and you can shake your hands and say, "Well, okay, Douglas Campbell, we have heard one—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, that is enough. We have allowed you very much time to express yourself. We would ask you to leave at this point. You do not go around calling people names on the committee and the clerk of the committee. That is enough.

Mr Campbell: I have a right to read this, and you do not have a right to interrupt me.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, you do not have the right to be ignorant with people of this committee.

Mr Campbell: I am sorry, sir. Under—

The Vice-Chair: Please, can you get security to take him out of here. Call security. Thank you very much.

It has been an interesting month through our tours through the province. As you can see, we have gotten presentations from basically all sides, issues that we face as Canadians in the future and things that need to be resolved in order to get the country through the impasse that we see ourselves at.

I think we would like to say thanks to a couple of people for making this possible. We would like to say thank you to the crew that allowed us to televise all of these proceedings over the parliamentary channel. People need to realize the amount of work that was put into this and the amount of hours these people have had to work to make sure that Ontarians had the opportunity to hear the viewpoints of all people across the province.

We appreciate the presentations that were made. We have had many presentations, over 500, which brought quite a few ideas and gave us a lot of things that we need to go back at this point and take a look at so that we can formulate a position for our interim report that will be tabled in the House in the month of March. Thank you to all the presenters.

Also to the members of the committee, we would like to thank you, all the people who were on the select committee, for the work that it involved. I think we also need to say thank you to our constituents in our own home ridings. Many of our members who are here obviously had to take a lot of time away from their home ridings in order to be able to go out and to do the committee work that needed to be done. On behalf of the members of the committee, we would like to thank our constituents for allowing us

the time to be able to do this. Mr Winninger, you had something?

Mr Winninger: I believe we should also thank the TV crew that has worked so tirelessly during this tour.

The Vice-Chair: On behalf of the committee, this is our last televised proceeding; by no means will this be the

end of the process. The process is going to continue past this point, and we will be discussing more in regard to the whole question. Until next time, thank you very much.

The committee adjourned at 1648.

CONTENTS

Thursday 28 February 1991

Committee room 151

Canadian Hearing Society	C-1009
East Indian Workers Association of Canada	C-1010
Hindu Solidarity and Continuing Committee on Race Relations	C-1012
Women Working with Immigrant Women	C-1014
Voice of Women	C-1016
Ontario Women's Action Coalition	C-1019
Ontario Canadian Relations Resource Centre	C-1023
Conseil des organismes francophones du Toronto métropolitain, Centre francophone de Toronto	C-1024
Charles Caccia	C-1025
Disabled Women's Network	C-1027
Metropolitan Tenants Legal Services	C-1029
Toronto Aboriginal and Metis Association	C-1031
Afternoon sitting	C-1033
Ontario Public Service Employees Union	C-1033
Daily Bread Food Bank, Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, Child Poverty Action Group, Bread Not Circuses Coalition	C-1034
Communist League Candidates for Mayor of Toronto and Montreal	
Candidats de la Ligue communiste pour le poste de Maire de Toronto et de Montréal	C-1040
Persons United for Self-Help in Ontario	C-1043
Assembly of First Nations, Chiefs of Ontario	C-1046
Association interculturelle franco-ontarienne	C-1049
Centre for Equality Rights in Accommodation	C-1051
Adjournment	C-1055

Committee room 1

Canadian Alliance in Solidarity with Native Peoples	C-1056
Ontario Federation of South Asian Students, Ontario Council of Sikhs	C-1058
Iuriiy Weretelnik	C-1061
First People's Cultural and Recreational Centre in Scarborough, Non-Profit Inc	C-1062
Rupee MacMillan	C-1063
Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto and York Region	C-1064
Senior Student Study Group, Upper Canada College	C-1067
Chief R.K. (Joe) Miskokomon	C-1069
Matthew Furgiuele	C-1072
David Conrad	C-1073
Native Council of Canada	C-1074
United Indian Councils of the Mississauga and Chippewa Nations	C-1076
Association des femmes d'affaires du Québec	C-1078
Canadian Pensioners Concerned	C-1081
Afternoon sitting	C-1084
David Baker	C-1084
Islamic Co-ordinating Council, Toronto	C-1086
Committee on the Future of Canada	C-1087
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario	C-1090
Peel Multicultural Council	C-1092
Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association	C-1093
Steven Kerzner	C-1096
Chris Villinger	C-1097
Ken Kafien	C-1098
John Copping	C-1099
Association of Ontario Health Centres	C-1100
J.K. Campbell	C-1103
Adjournment	C-1106

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)

Acting Chair: Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winner, David (London South NDP)

Substitution:

Wilson, Gary (Kingston and The Islands NDP) for Ms Harrington

Clerks pro tem:

Carrozza, Franco

Deller, Deborah

Freedman, Lisa

Staff:

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



C-21 1991

C-21 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 24 April 1991

**Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation**

Organization

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Harold Brown

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 24 avril 1991

**Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération**

Organisation

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Harold Brown

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 24 April 1991

The committee met at 1541 in room 151.

ORGANIZATION

The Chair: Welcome, members of the committee, back to this, our first public meeting since the end of our first phase and the presentation of our interim report.

I just want to indicate that, as you know, and for those who may be following us later on the parliamentary channel when this meeting will be broadcast, this is a meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, and the purpose of it, essentially, is to try to move along with the organization of the second stage of the committee's work.

We have had, over the last couple of weeks, as members know, in addition to one brief formal meeting of the committee, a couple of meetings of the subcommittee. Today we have a report from the subcommittee on committee business, which I will read out for the record, and to which I would then like to add some comments and I am sure the members of the subcommittee wish to. We will then discuss that report and make some decisions about the way in which our work will develop over the next few months.

"The subcommittee on business met on Monday 22 April 1991 for the purpose of discussing the committee's possible course of action. It was agreed that the committee should not be expected to conclude its deliberations and make a final report by 27 June, but rather to continue its work throughout the summer recess into the fall sitting, and to make a report on its findings by 31 October 1991." That is one of the significant issues that we will have to discuss.

"It was agreed that the committee should commence its second phase of deliberations with briefings from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. Invitations will be extended to various experts to meet with the committee during the spring sitting and summer recess to discuss relevant studies that they are conducting.

"It was agreed that the committee would provide opportunities for social and economic stakeholders in the future of Ontario in Confederation to advise the committee on the ramifications of possible future changes to the Canadian Confederation, and that the agenda for these discussions would be determined by the committee.

"It was agreed that the committee should seek opportunities for informal bilateral discussions with corresponding legislative bodies of other jurisdictions.

"It was agreed that the committee should explore the convening of a conference to be held in the fall in order to enable further public discussion on Ontario in Confederation.

"It was further agreed that the committee would attempt to arrange for public input on specific topics through the broadcast facility by setting up phone-in programs and interviews."

That is submitted from the subcommittee. I just add by way of elaboration on some of those points, which I hope

pick up on some of the discussion we had here in the committee the last time we met, that I think it has become clear to us as we look at the many issues we have identified from our interim report that need further exploration, that it is necessary for us to be able to go beyond the end of June in order to properly address those issues in the kind of detail that will be useful to the Legislature and to the government.

For that purpose, the first major recommendation we are bringing forward is to extend the work of the committee beyond the end of June and into the fall, recognizing, as we discussed within the subcommittee and I think was expressed here earlier, that we will also need, in arranging our work between now and the end of June, to take a look at some of the issues that may require prompt attention. That is not in any way saying that some issues are more important than others, but simply recognizing that the present situation warrants that some of the issues we should be looking at, for example, around the questions of Quebec's future in Canada and all the issues related to separation of powers, we may indeed want to address first.

In addition to that, we have discussed the question of aboriginal rights and the need for that issue to be looked at as well. We have done some work also with the assistance of Mr Winninger with respect to pulling together people whom we would invite from the native communities to come and talk with us in a more specific way about the kinds of things the committee could be doing. Subject to approval by the committee here today, it would be our intention to proceed with that and to then make arrangements at one of our meetings some time between now and the end of June for that to be scheduled.

Likewise, I have discussed with the Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs the possibility of a briefing for the committee for our meeting next week, and that is in the works. If the committee agrees, we will proceed with that, which will begin by giving us an overview of where, basically, some of those issues are in terms of what thinking or discussion exists. It will give us a place from which to proceed in more clearly identifying the kind of detailed work that we may want to do as a committee.

Also, as we recognized throughout the process, it is important for us in the second stage to speak with various experts in the field on the various issues, and that is something we can do in a very systematic way.

I think we have all recognized the importance of continuing the discussion both with the interested stakeholders, the people who would be affected by those decisions, and members of the public in general. I think in two ways at least, perhaps three ways, it would be our intention to continue that. One way is, whenever possible or feasible, to include in some of our discussions members of interested

groups, and the reference to native groups would be one clear example of that.

In addition to that, there is the possibility later in our work of using the parliamentary channel to allow people to phone in and talk with us. Obviously, still possible at some point is the issue of public meetings of some kind, and one major way is the conference we are suggesting as a way of bringing together politicians, experts, so-called experts, and members of the public. We are suggesting that the fall would give us time to explore that and to put together something relatively serious in nature, with the kind of planning it would require.

I know Ms Harrington wants to comment. If there are other members of the subcommittee who would like to add any comments to what I have said, I would go to them first. Okay, Ms Harrington.

Ms Harrington: Just a point of clarification. The six paragraphs here lay out very clearly what we discussed at our previous meetings and obviously at the subcommittee. I just wanted to note that the words "native" and "aboriginals," that we had discussed at the previous meeting, are not included in the six paragraphs. In which one would it be most appropriate?

The Chair: I think we can simply add them. We have got the committee report in front of us now for discussion. It was certainly always understood in the subcommittee's work that, in fact, that would be one of the first ways in which we would involve the stakeholders.

Ms Harrington: When it says "economic stakeholders," is that the term that would include those?

The Chair: In my understanding, yes, but again, there is nothing to prevent us, if you wanted to be really specific—one of the things in front of us is exactly that, and I think if there is agreement beyond these six points, that, in fact, encompasses us proceeding with the invitation to the various native leaders to come and join us at some point.

Ms Harrington: I was just hoping they might specifically be mentioned in here.

Mr Winninger: Perhaps after the words "social and economic stakeholders" we could add "including our native representatives" or some words along those lines.

1550

The Chair: Sure. The other way would be for somebody to simply move, if we wanted to have it as a matter of public record, that we extend an invitation.

Mr Winninger: I so move.

The Chair: Mr Winninger is adding that, okay.

Mr Beer: I think this sets out, generally speaking, what we agreed to. I think the comment that Margaret made and that David followed up on is one that we would agree with. Certainly we discussed very specifically the idea that David had brought forward of how we might, in a very specific way, meet with the aboriginal leaders, and we definitely want to do that.

I would like to work through the paragraphs, because I think it is important, both for the committee and for those who are watching this, for the public sense of our deliberations, that one of the things that guided us in extending the

time frame for the committee was, as we all recall during the discussions around Meech Lake, that as that discussion went on, poll after poll would show that people felt they did not really understand what was, in fact, involved in the specifics of that discussion. I think we have always said it is part of our mandate from the beginning that our deliberations are not simply for ourselves, but more broadly for everyone in the province.

The kind of learning that we are still going to undergo we want to share with people in the province. Therefore, this stage in our hearings, particularly in the spring session when we are more confined to base, if you will, is perhaps a good time to bring in people who are working actively on a number of specific reports and studies on various elements of the Constitution. This would give us sittings in what would probably be part of August, September, when we can again bring in points of view on issues such as, for example, the Canada clause; from our earlier deliberations and as mentioned in our interim report we know there are many groups who feel strongly about how we might define that and the components of it in terms of the various multicultural communities, the question of rights, and women's concerns about how those are protected in the charter, the disabled and so on.

Then, having sufficient time to plan the conference, we can ensure we have a very broad representation from the province. I think we have also discussed that, as a committee, we may want to commission some studies for that conference. We noted that John Roberts's Confederation of Tomorrow Conference, back in 1967, had particular studies that were commissioned and issued.

The Destiny Canada Conference, which Bill Davis's government sponsored in 1977 at York, also had a lot of preliminary work, so that when people got there, there was a lot of material that people had been able to go through and they could begin to deal with different issues. So it seemed we were still trying to get this balance where information that we simply did not possess was going to be brought to us and, because of the way our hearings go, to the people in the province, and at the same time we would ensure that, in a broad sense, people would continue to participate in our discussions.

I think when you looked at all of those, it was going to be impossible by the end of June to come to any really final conclusion on the part of the committee; so I think for that reason we just felt it was important. By saying 31 October, I think this gives us plenty of time to hold that conference in the fall, to take into account what is said there, and to be able to include that information, as well as what we glean between now and the end of June, and in our summer and September hearings, to include all of that in our final report.

The other thing that I think we have all learned from the process around Meech Lake, and it is important to reiterate it, was that you cannot deal with only one issue, no matter how valid the arguments may seem or how strong the pressures. There is an expectation among Canadians, and certainly among Ontarians, that we will be looking at a number of issues as we go along, obviously including the question of Quebec in Canada, and the aboriginal peoples;

questions dealing with multiculturalism, with other rights, the place of the charter, the other issues that, in fact, we identified in our report. I think we were very conscious of that and wanted to make sure it happened.

Another point that came up was that, in dealing specifically with the question of Quebec in Canada, we had identified in our interim report a number of options that had been mentioned to us about what kind of Canada we might be looking at, and we felt there was a need to try to spell that out a little more clearly. What would those different options mean? What would that look like? If we are talking about a more decentralized federation, how might that be described and set out, because there are people in the province and in the country who are looking at that and working on it. By the same token, that incredible jargon phrase, asymmetrical federalism: Once we have tried to determine what the word means, what would that look like?

I think the subcommittee felt strongly that for the first time there is the possibility of separation or the independence of Quebec. In real and specific terms, what does that mean and what are the implications for this province and for the country? Not that that is by any means our preference, but we have a responsibility to people in the province to look at what those different options are and begin to spell out some of the implications. I think we see that as something we can do quite constructively in this session through having a number of people come before us and sharing that information with people in the province.

This would mean, if we can go forward this way, that we also recognize that many other provinces have just started their investigations or inquiries. For example, Alberta, I think, is going to conduct public hearings in June. I am not sure what the timetable is for New Brunswick. Manitoba and ourselves are about at the same point, but we made the reference to bilateral discussions at this point because of the difference in time tables; but that does not preclude the possibility that later in the fall, once most of the work of the different committees is finished, we would still look at some meeting that might bring together legislators from the different committees to discuss what we found.

What we are doing is part of a much larger process, part of a set of building blocks, if you will. It would be great if we could come up with the final and ultimate answer, but we recognize that what we do will go together with what is going on in other provinces, what Spicer is doing, what the different federal bodies are doing. Even when we finish, 31 October, that will not be the end. There will be a continuing process whereby we, as legislators, and the people of this province will be much better informed and aware of the issues and options. We will have been able to go back to everything that we set out in the interim report and explore that, and ultimately come to some agreement and some conclusions.

I think what we have set out here, Mr Chair, is a useful way for us to proceed, and it will give us a lot more flexibility than if we had to conclude by the end of June. Thank you.

1600

Mr Harnick: In the sub-committee meeting, we discussed extending the time, and I am happy to see that the

time will be extended. I am unclear about whether there will be any interim report expected of us. Certainly if there is going to be an interim report, I would hope it will be presented to the Legislature and debated before the House rises on 28 June. That was certainly something that we, as a subcommittee, agreed upon.

I would like to make another point regarding this document, and I am referring to what would be the fourth paragraph, dealing with social and economic stakeholders. One of the things that I thought we decided in the subcommittee was that we will, in fact, be looking specifically at the economic ramifications for Ontario if Quebec should decide to separate. That is not clear in that paragraph. I think it should be, because we agreed that it is certainly the most significant aspect of what our work will be in this phase, among other aspects of work that are obviously very significant. That is one area we specifically wish to concentrate on between now and the time the House rises, for a couple of reasons, one of which is that it could most easily be done while we were involved with other duties at Queen's Park. We felt most of the work this would entail could be done from Queen's Park rather than travelling.

In addition, I have a number of motions I would like to add to this document, which we discussed at the subcommittee meeting. Is now the appropriate time, Mr Chairman, to do that?

The Chair: May I suggest that there are a couple of ways in which we can proceed. I think your comments have raised a couple of other points, Mr Harnick, and that is: We can deal with the various suggestions that people have made either as amendments to this report or we could adopt the report and then proceed and deal with those as items arising out of it. I do not think it matters much one way or the other to the Chair. Procedurally, Mr Clerk, might it be easier to deal with this as amendments?

Clerk of the Committee: You can deal with it either as amendments or as an aftertheme, but it has nothing to do with this.

The Chair: Some of them are amendments; some of them, I think, are in fact more specifically actions under each of these points. I think that the one you have discussed with us in terms of information, maybe is one that arises out of this. But we do not need to get into a procedural wrangle about it; we will just deal with it. What I was going to suggest was that after Mrs O'Neill spoke—she is next on the list—we just basically go back to each of these points. Maybe we can deal with any changes or matters arising out of each one or we can just adopt the report and then do it that way. I do not think it matters.

Mr Harnick: Certainly I am not particular about the form in which we do this as long as what we are trying to do is clear on the record so we do not have problems later on.

The Chair: No, I agree. I think it is important to put all those things on the record with agreements by the committee as we go through. Let me try this then. Maybe it is easier if we just go through—Mr Bisson, would you move the report so that we actually have it formally in front of us?

Mr Bisson: I so move.

The Chair: I have not heard anything that anyone has said so far that conflicts in any way, as I read this report. If it is easier, we can just adopt the report and then go back through the paragraphs and deal with all the items that arise out of those, including the item Mr Winninger suggested.

Mr Winninger: I am perhaps not entirely clear on the process. I had a suggestion for inclusion of an item that was discussed at our meeting last week, which I did not see on here. I do not know whether I should be adverting to this now or later.

The Chair: I was suggesting that could also be, because I think that is one specific act that certainly falls under paragraph 4 in terms of providing people who are going to be affected by these changes with an opportunity to come and talk to us. I saw that as one area where we would be doing that. I think people feel the need to put that on the record. I think we should do that as well.

Mr Winninger: I did have an additional point. I am just wondering whether I should—

The Chair: I think what you are saying is that maybe it is easier to deal with those as amendments to the report, and we can do that. We can just go through each of these points one by one and people can add the items that they have.

Mr Bisson: We already have a motion to adopt this as read.

The Chair: Yes, but we can have amendments to it as we go through. The motion is on the floor right now by Mr Bisson to adopt the subcommittee report.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Most of mine are questions. I wondered if somebody had the date for the beginning of the fall sitting?

The Chair: No.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I want to know how long we have from when we come back here to 31 October. I was just trying to get that time frame in my mind.

Mr Bisson: The House would be returning the third week in September, I would imagine.

The Chair: The clerk will find that out for us, but that would not preclude us from meeting. I think the intention would be for us to meet during the summer recess, which goes right up until the House resumes. So in fact this is August and the better part of September.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am just wondering. I would like to know that time frame and break it up into the right slots because we all have other duties.

The Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs—it says invitations will be extended to various academics, and I guess what is lacking here is any reference, for instance, to our official representative in Quebec. We were talking about this matter very very briefly the other day, and Treasury, as far as I know, has not done much on this. I would just like to have it extended there to say “academics and government representatives and/or officials.”

The Chair: I think that certainly does not conflict, Mrs O'Neill, with what the intent is. I know it is in fact one of the areas that Mr Harnick will touch on in his

motion, in terms of requests from various government ministries and agencies.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay. Next, I wonder if we could have, through our clerk, the informal bilateral discussions with corresponding legislative bodies. I get bits and pieces of this and I certainly do enjoy getting the morning line every day, but I am wondering, because we have not had such for about three months, if now we could have an update about where each of those legislative bodies is. Have some of them recessed? I know some of them have presented interim reports, as we have. I have seen one, I think in Manitoba. I would like to know if we could find out where all these committees are, what their time frames are, so we would then be able to work best in conjunction with them.

The Chair: We could try for the next meeting, when we have the briefing schedule—if the committee agrees to proceed with that—to add that as another piece of information for the committee: the update on where all the other committees are.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I know this convention or conference is starting to be a subject of interest for some people. Have we talked at all about possible agenda or participants?

The Chair: No, I think in truth we have not talked much about it other than in very general terms.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay.

The Chair: That is why we couched the recommendation there in terms of exploring, continuing to explore, but I think there would have to be a sense of agreement probably today that we really are serious about doing it. Then we could start through the subcommittee to pursue it in some detail and bring back some suggestions.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think that if we are going to do it in September, this is certainly not too soon to talk to people who are busy, as they all are.

The broadcast facility, is that TVOntario? Have you talked more about that?

The Chair: We have talked about it in the subcommittee in terms of our other parliamentary channel and we have also mentioned it with respect to TVO. We have not done anything in terms of approaching them or anything like that, but that may be a possibility.

On your first question, we have the calendar; the fall session begins on 23 September, so there are three full weeks in September prior to that for meetings.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I thought maybe I could think about a bit of a holiday. I was not thinking about meetings.

The Chair: I understand there is July, then there are four weeks in August.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: And three weeks in September?

The Chair: And three weeks in September, plus all the weeks following that and Christmas and 31 October.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We will get Christmas day off, though, will we not?

The Chair: Let me suggest that we go back. Under each of the paragraphs, or on some of them, people have already

highlighted a number of what I think are amendments, technically, but which will be additions to the report.

1610

Mr Harnick: I think your first point, with respect to what happens to June if the times are extended, fits properly under paragraph 2, so we probably should deal with that first. Let me just say to you that my understanding, from speaking to the government House leader, is that technically, in terms of how our mandate as it presently sits has been interpreted, it will require a motion of the House to extend the committee's mandate beyond the end of June, because the standing order authorizes us to sit until the end of June. So they will put that in the works upon our request to do so and upon the understanding that there is agreement among the three parties for that to happen. So in adopting this report, I would understand it to be also our request to the House leaders for it to be put through the House at whatever appropriate time.

But I think the issue you raised is about what happens with respect to June in terms of reporting. As you recall, we discussed in the subcommittee—and perhaps even here last time, I cannot recall—the need some of us felt for some kind of report in June, even if it was only a progress report. Quite right, your reaction to that was that if it were going to happen you felt the need for time in the Legislature for debate on it.

In looking at the business scheduled to be put before the House between now and the end of June, I do not think there is going to be a lot of time available for debate. I do not know how that may affect what we want to do with respect to a report in June. So I just put that out.

Mr Harnick: Can I, by way of motion, move that it be up to the committee to decide whether an interim report will be prepared to be delivered in June and, if the committee agrees to prepare such an interim report, that it be tabled in the Legislature during the month of June and debated at that time?

The Chair: That leaves open the question of whether we come back at a later point to decide whether we will in fact make a report based upon our sense of the work, and if so, to request time for debate in the House.

Mr Harnick: Yes. I think it is hard for us to decide now whether we want to do a report or not; we will have the opportunity when we see how we are progressing to decide whether a report is viable. If we agree that a report is viable, then we will table it in the Legislature with time to debate it before the Legislature rises for the summer.

The Chair: All right. On that amendment then, Mr Bisson.

Mr Bisson: One of the things we discussed in the subcommittee was that obviously the work our committee needs to do now is to undertake specific tasks vis-à-vis the Constitution. One of the things you raised was in regard to the economic fallout or whatever if there were to be separation between Quebec and the rest of Canada, the question of native rights, various questions.

My understanding from the subcommittee was that what we would table in June, if it was done, would be

reports as to where we are with specific questions, and not another interim report.

Mr Harnick: That, it is my understanding, would be the interim report. All I am saying is, why commit ourselves now to doing an interim report if we can give ourselves the option of delivering an interim report only if we have something to report on.

Mr Bisson: Exactly, on particular issues. Okay. All right. I agree with you.

The Chair: It may be that as we get closer to that we have in fact simply clarified some of the issues, had some progress to report. I think, in what I am understanding Mr Harnick's amendment to be, we may or may not decide to issue that report at that point or simply leave it to be part of the final report.

Mr Harnick: But it must be understood as part of my motion, that if we prepare such a report it has to be debated before the Legislature rises for the summer recess.

Mr Beer: I think that was our conclusion when we were discussing this matter at the subcommittee. There is a question as to whether we need another interim report. It is critical, I think, to see that our final report is 31 October. That is the key report, if you like, in terms of our final conclusions as a committee, but if we do table another interim report or continuing report, whatever we call it, in June, I think it is very important that there be time for it to be debated, so that if 27 June is the last day of the session we would want our report tabled presumably a week ahead of time. That would then allow time for debate. That was what happened with the report three years ago, and I think there were perhaps two days of debate or part of two days—I forget. That was a final report, but that would need to be there so we would concur with what Charles has put forward.

I think it is important that as a committee we reserve judgement at this point as to whether we need a report. We should not do one just for the sake of having yet another interim report because, as I say, the work we do now, together with what happens in August and September, and the conference, all forms part of a whole that leads to that final report.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think it is important that we keep our fellow legislators and indeed the province in touch with what we are doing.

I have had a lot of response to what this committee did in its first interim report, through my local newspaper submissions, and certainly in personal mailings I have developed a constituency interest in this, and I think most of us have.

We are very fortunate to be able to talk about this on a regular basis, and not all our colleagues are. I know there is a great deal of interest in our caucus on it. I am positive there is in all caucuses. If there is not, there is a reason. I feel strongly that we should try to keep our colleagues as updated as possible with what we are doing. I think the leadership role that the people of Ontario ask for is partly on us, not only on the Premier. I feel quite strongly that we have some kind of goal of at least an update, even if it is just submitting a report we received from somebody else, that we owe some kind of a release before people go out

for two months to their constituencies while we continue to work on this—what I consider, no matter what is going on here at Queen's Park today or tomorrow, is a fundamental legislative responsibility in 1991.

So I feel very strongly that we have to send something with our colleagues—an update on where we are with the issue. I think we did that with the interim report. Most people, and certainly the people in my constituency, were very surprised at what we were able to come up with in a short time, the decisions we were able to make, the directions we began to take. They want to know that we are continuing. In fact, some people are impatient that we have not done much in the last month. They do not realize there are transitions between reports and starting new phases, but you hear what I am saying.

I honestly feel that we are privileged and I think we should use that privilege well and keep our fellow legislators and the general public and particularly our own constituents aware of what we are doing in the best way we can. That means writing something down or transmitting something, and I strongly believe we should have two more days of debate on this issue before we leave. I think we should start to ask our House leaders for such.

Mr Bisson: Just for the sake of semantics, I would feel a bit more comfortable if we were to call it a progress report rather than an interim report, because I think it denotes something a little bit different.

1620

Mrs Y. O'Neill: No problem.

Mr Harnick: I have no problem with that.

The Chair: A friendly amendment. Okay. So the amendment would read then, "a progress report." All right, Mr Winninger.

Mr Winninger: I was not privy to the discussions of the subcommittee, but I left the meeting last week with the recollection that we might consider specific reports on specific issues if we could not prepare our final report by the original date, and I heard and accepted the fact that we should extend the time, because we do not want this to be a rushed report. Perhaps we could consider doing justice to more specific issues, and doing it well, than canvassing the whole picture and filing yet another interim progress report. So my thought was, and perhaps this is a friendly amendment to the report, that we could add a phrase to the end of paragraph 2, which would simply say, "We do not rule out the anticipation that we might be filing some specific issue reports in the interim."

The Chair: Sorry, what were you suggesting, Mr Winninger?

Mr Winninger: I am suggesting that after the end of the second paragraph, we put in words to the effect that we are not precluding the distribution of specific issue reports, dealing with such issues as women, native rights, multi-cultural rights, economic rights, so that we can focus our attention more, in the meantime, on these singular issues and not try to cover the whole canvas by 30 June, which most members seem to agree may now be an unreasonable deadline.

Mr Harnick: I do not think what Mr Winninger is proposing is necessary, because the way I have worded the motion is that it will be up to the committee to decide if an interim report or reports, if you like, should be prepared. The form of those reports is up to the committee, if and when they decide there will be interim or progress reports, so I think the option is there for us to make that decision, as a committee, when we see how our progress evolves.

Mr Winninger: Now that you have explained it, I find it more acceptable. Thank you.

The Chair: I think the understanding of a progress report is that the shape of it would obviously have to be determined at whatever point in time we decide to issue it, if we decide to issue it, right? I think Mr Harnick's amendment basically says that the committee would, at some later point, decide whether or not to issue a progress report at the end of June, with the caveat that if that report was going to be issued, in whatever form it might be, there should be time allowed in the House for debate. It could take the form, Mr Winninger, of specific issue-oriented reports.

The only other thing I would add to what Mrs O'Neill said is that it seems to me a good argument for trying to put together a report by the end of June. There may also be, however, other ways that we should take a look at in terms of keeping the rest of our colleagues updated. I do not know, for example, if at some point between now and June there might be enough interest for us, as a committee, to hold a meeting to which we would invite other interested MPPs, where we could share some of the work that we had been able to garner until that point and give them an opportunity to talk to us, because although there was some debate—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We might miss the crowds.

The Chair: We might miss the crowds, yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So we might want to call some in.

The Chair: I know there were a number of other people from the government caucus who were interested in speaking on our interim report but did not get the opportunity because of the time allocated in the House. I am sure that is the case for the other caucuses as well. In fact, if there is that interest there, then we should be looking for all sorts of ways to tap into it.

On Mr Harnick's amendment, is there any further discussion? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

I think the next item, if we are going to go through it in sequence, is under the next paragraph, Mr Harnick, where your promised motion would fall in terms of the briefing, because I think it would fit as part of that.

Mr Harnick: Essentially, in light of the decision by the subcommittee to specifically study the economic impact and ramifications for Ontario if Quebec should decide to separate, I am bringing a series of motions requesting the government to provide us with certain written briefs. The Premier has indicated that he would be prepared to make available to us any of the documentation which exists and, I believe, which could be prepared to facilitate our work. Rather than wait and bring these things up as they arise in May or June or July, I think it would be worth our while to obtain as much material now as we possibly can. For that

reason, I have a series of motions requesting certain documents and material that is either available now or could be prepared to facilitate the work of the committee.

My first motion is that we request a written brief from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs on the economic impact of Quebec's possible separation from Canada and the impact on Ontario specifically.

My second is a motion that the committee request a written brief from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs on the concept of a triple E Senate or whatever various other models have been studied for the reform of the upper chamber as proposed by other provinces and the impact of those models on Ontario's position within the federal institutions.

My next motion is for a written report from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs dealing with the concept of constituent assemblies: what models they may now, or up to this point, have studied, and how a constituent assembly might be organized to bring the representation from across Ontario for the purpose of rewriting our Constitution.

The next motion would be a request for a written report from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs on the subject of language policy, particularly the impact on Ontario if language became the responsibility of each individual province.

The next motion would be to request a written report from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs on the subject of immigration, particularly the impact on Ontario if immigration were made a provincial responsibility.

The final one would be a request for a written report from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs on the concept of aboriginal self-government, including any models of how it might be organized.

Those are the documents that I think we should have before us, because we will have to cover each and every one of these topics and I suspect that the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, if it does not already have material that it can provide us with on some of these subjects, can obtain the material or prepare it for us to facilitate the work that we will ultimately have to do.

The Chair: Procedurally, I am going to treat all of what you said as one motion, because I think it is the same motion with respect to each of those items and what you are requesting is in effect information on a series of issues that exist or may exist.

Mr Harnick: I have no problem with that.

The Chair: I guess the one thing we need to be clear about, as I mentioned to you earlier, is that what we are asking for on each of those issues is in effect whatever information may exist within the ministry and not asking it to do the work for us if it does not exist. I think that is an issue where we get into a whole discussion about the role of the ministry vis-à-vis the role of this committee as a legislative committee.

1630

Mr Harnick: I do not want to ask them to do the work for us, but they may well be looking at some of these items and I would hope that they would share with us whatever they are in the course of doing now and prepare for us any briefs that they would otherwise be in the course

of preparing, because it certainly will make the work that we do here much easier, and I just remind the members of the committee that the Premier indicated he would be happy to facilitate us in this way.

The Chair: I am raising that just so that we will be as clear as we can. Obviously, when we hear back from the ministry, it will no doubt give us whatever comments it has on that as well. Very clearly I think there may be areas that we may identify as a committee on which we need some further assistance and we may want to do some further work. I guess if we are treating the request as the basis for knowing what exists, it would then help us in determining what else there might be that we may need to look into. We could then make a determination at that point as to how we go about doing that.

Mr Harnick: And can we also make inquiries, if they do not have any material on some of this subject matter, whether they will be doing some work in the areas and whether the work is imminent so that we can make use of the research that they are doing?

The Chair: The other comment that I will make, and I think I may have mentioned this to you as well, Mr Harnick, and I do not think it is necessary for us to get into it at this point, but I do want to raise it to put it on the record: In some of those areas there may in fact be some reason why some of that information in fact can be shared with the committee and perhaps there may be a feeling there is some that cannot be. I do not know. I am not trying in any way to prejudge that. I have no idea, but it seems to me that, again, we need to be conscious about our role as a legislative committee and some of the work that is being done on the part of the government in that respect. It is something that we will have to deal with, I think, as we go on and get the responses.

Let me go to the other speakers then on this motion, starting with Mr Bisson.

Mr Bisson: A couple of points. One of the points you raised, Mr Harnick, was the whole question of allowing the committee to access various ministries to answer specific questions. I think obviously it is something that we would want to do as a committee to extend that not only to the ministries but beyond to be able to get more specific information.

One of the things you discussed in your motion was the whole question of putting together a report by which we would be able to spell out the economic consequences vis-à-vis Ontario should Quebec decide to separate. I would just like to be on record to make it clear that I feel that although that information is necessary, so that people are aware of all of the various scenarios no matter what the options may be, I certainly would not want to see it as a major part of our committee's work.

Often, with an issue such as that, people can utilize those numbers for whatever advantage from whatever side of the argument they may be coming from. Although it is important people have that information before them, and I would certainly support your motion so that we can have that as part of our report, I would not want to see it become a major part of our report, because I see the function of

this committee as coming up with possible solutions so that at the end our Legislature and our government have some tools to work with in order to deal with the whole constitutional question. If it is on that premise, I would be prepared to support you on the first motion. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr Harnick: What the contents of our final report ultimately are I do not think any of us can predict right now; I only bring up this matter because it appears to be forefront in the whole discussion and we have to face the reality of what I guess most of us in this room would describe as the worst possible scenario, and that is all I am doing. What part this will play in the final report is up to the committee when we reach that stage. I do not know what else to say in response to your comments.

Mr Bisson: My only concern, and I had spoken to you previously about this, is that I think that although it is a question we need to shed some light on, there is no question about that, and it is something obviously that this committee should be looking at as part of its overall mandate, I would not want to see it become a major focus. I think that this committee should be doing is providing tools to members of our Legislature and to the government to be able to adequately deal with the constitutional problems that we have today. That is the context in which I would give support.

I just want to explain where I am coming from. I believe that one of the difficulties we find ourselves in in the nation today vis-à-vis the Constitution is that often we tend to get our backs up trying to deal with the emotions of this issue. I think what the people in Canada need, and what Ontarians need, is to be able to deal with this whole question—what are some of the problems we are having with regard to our Constitution, is it reflecting the needs of the people, does it properly address the concerns of the people of Canada in the various regions?—and I would not want to see us distracted from that work. Basically that is what I was saying. I have another point afterwards.

Mr Harnick: Certainly it is not my intention that we examine this one aspect to the exclusion of all of the other important issues. I did not want to give that impression to anyone and I do not think the Chair would permit that to happen at any rate, or the other members on the committee. I certainly did not intend that to be the impression I was giving.

Mr Bisson: Just a clarification on another point you raised as one of your motions: you wanted the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs to look at the question of what would happen to French-language rights in provinces should—can you repeat that particular motion? I am not sure if I got that.

Mr Harnick: The motion was somewhat more general than that. It was a request for any written reports from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs on the subject of language policy and the impact on Ontario if language were to become the responsibility of the individual province.

Mr Bisson: I certainly pray that would never be the situation that the federal government would put us in, but I also recognize that to a certain extent is already the practice under the Constitution, that the legislatures of each province

have the right to determine to what extent they want to provide French-language services within their provinces.

Mr Harnick: No, it has nothing to do with French language services. It has to do with whether language rights should become a provincial jurisdiction, and what impact that would have on Ontario.

Mr Bisson: Oh, okay.

Mr Winninger: I certainly can see great benefit in having this background information Mr Harnick has suggested. I think it may in fact relieve some of the burden of our overworked legislative research staff, but at the same time, I do not know that we need to duplicate their effort in any way and I do not think we can forget their role in producing documentation for us in these various areas.

There may in fact be some papers in existence at Intergovernmental Affairs which that department can share with us. They may in fact be willing to prepare some additional documentation for us. That offer was made at the outset of these hearings. Certainly it should be in the form of an invitation, in my view, and not construed as a direction and there may in fact, as our Chair has observed, be some information in those reports that is not for the general public. For that reason, I think we should restrict our motion to one of inviting the ministry to produce the kinds of documentation that you have suggested.

Mr Beer: I think we want to get as much information as we can, and clearly the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs will have a number of papers. In addition, I suspect in some cases it may be that they are going to other ministries. For example, Treasury may have some work that they have done with respect to the various economic consequences, Citizenship with respect to immigration. I would take it as read that what is meant in the motion is that whatever documentation is available would be made available to the committee.

1640

It is also important, and we may want to discuss this with the deputy minister next week, that some of the other work that is ongoing—I am thinking in particular of the York University group that is looking at a series of specific questions and where we would want to include them among our experts—having a sense of the work, as you say, David, that is out there and is being done. I think it was just the other day that there was a report, a study done by Tom Courchene of Queen's University. Clearly that is something that we would want to get. Our own research people would probably want to do a bit of a summary of that and then, I think, that is an individual who we would want to come before us.

As I read the motion before us, it is to obtain whatever is available, and I am sure, given the Premier's statement that we will get those; then to discuss with the deputy minister and others on her staff what other things in their view would be helpful to the committee, either commissioned by the government or commissioned by other people, that we would want to make part of our public record.

Mr Malkowski: I would like to follow up on what Charles was saying and the brief from intergovernmental affairs related to the economy. I think it should also provide

information from the federal perspective on the economy. Remember we discussed the paper from Alberta and their statistics? It showed information about the economy, how the Ontario economy was in recession and the western economy was growing. Yet our statistics showed something different because it was looking at trade.

My feeling is that we should collect as much information from each province and get everybody's perspective so that we know what the economic impact really is.

The Chair: My understanding is that this kind of information would be included in the request, because I think we need to understand what the existing situation is in order to have some understanding of what the implications might be in the event of Quebec's separation.

Mr Harnick: My motivation for this motion is the recognition of the momentous task before us to learn about all of the issues that are going to be on the table. I do not think we are capable, within the time available, to do this work without the help of the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, the native affairs secretariat, the Treasury—because there is just too much to do. We may as well know what has been done and have it before us because it is going to help us, and it is quite simply that motivation that prompts me to ask for this material and the invitation of the Premier to do so.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I certainly agree with the thrust that is being taken here. I wonder if this list can be presented to the intergovernmental people before next week. They can at that point tell me where they are at—I am sure they have done a lot of this work—and what they feel may be impossible to complete within a given time.

I say this with all respect, Mr Bisson, that whether we like it or not there is a lot of study going on regarding what will happen if. I took with great interest and even emotion what you said about 1982 and Quebec before. But I know in my own community there are several groups looking at this possibility and its spinoff. It is starting to make the media. I do not think we can be left behind on this. I very strongly agree with you that this cannot be our total focus, but it has to be in the mix or else we will somehow not have a complete picture. We will not even be able to counter-balance that kind of argument if it is only in isolation in some of our constituencies.

Mr Bisson: I am not advocating that we not look at that question and not address it properly. That is not at all what I am advocating. My only concern is that I would not want to see it be a major focus of this committee in regard to a momentous task that we would undertake and we would say X amount of dollars is what it cost in the end. That is all I was cautioning, because of the discussions we have had before. Certainly we need to put all of the information in front of the people so that they understand what the consequences are socially, economically, and all of those things, and that would be part of it.

The Chair: I think we all understand the sensitivity of this particular issue and no doubt, in our usual way, we will figure out a way to both look at the issue and do it in a way that is sensitive to the feelings out there.

Just in checking with the clerk, if this amendment is adopted we would communicate, hopefully even as early as tomorrow, with the deputy minister. I guess in this case we should also do it formally with the minister, who in this case is the Premier. Then I certainly would pursue that with a discussion with the deputy minister at least, because I think it is useful, in terms of the briefing that we would be setting up for next week, for her to be able to share with us at that point at least some preliminary sense of what it might be possible to accede to.

Mr Harnick: Unfortunately, I have a conflict of time right now. Could I suggest that we vote on the first two items?

The Chair: I was going to take the vote. I have no further speakers, Mr Harnick, so I was actually going to proceed to the vote on your whole request at this point.

Mr Harnick: All right. I do not think we voted on the first one, did we?

The Chair: On which?

Mr Harnick: The idea of the committee, my amendment to the first one regarding the committee and—

The Chair: Yes, we did. We have adopted that already. I am going through and treating all of these as amendments and then at the end we will vote on the whole report as amended.

Mr Harnick: All right.

The Chair: I think that is the way we agreed we would do it. So I am taking Mr Harnick's motion as one motion at this point, dealing with a request primarily to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, although I think it was understood within that, to any other ministries that may in fact have some of that information.

Mr Beer: If they should so determine.

The Chair: Yes, to share with us and list the information that he has outlined.

Mr Bisson: How is it going to read?

Mr Harnick: I hope the motion reads as the Chairman just indicated: that the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs and any other ministry that has material relating to the economic impact of Quebec's separating from Canada; the economic impact on Ontario; information regarding reform of the Senate such as the triple E Senate and other various models and the impact of those various models on Ontario; the production of any written reports regarding the concept of the constituent assemblies; any written reports regarding language policy, particularly the impact on Ontario if language were made the responsibility of each individual province; any written report on the subject of immigration, particularly the impact on Ontario if immigration were to be made a provincial responsibility, and any written reports on the concept of aboriginal self-government, including several models on how it might be organized.

Mr Winninger: Could I add one item to that list, if the committee approves it? That would be any documentation relating to a division of powers or a revised division of powers.

Mr Harnick: Certainly.

1650

The Chair: Was there not also another item dealing with the charter?

Mr Harnick: I did not bring that up, but I can; any documentation that the government has, any reports dealing with an expansion of charter rights, be they individual rights or a social charter.

Mr Beer: Could we ask for the impact of the charter to date, because I think that was in our discussion at the subcommittee? I know there has been some work done on that sort of 10-year perspective. If that is there, that would be helpful on what the charter has meant.

The Chair: That will only take us to about 31 May; 25 June perhaps. All right. Everyone clear on that? All those in favour? Sorry, Mr Malkowski, you wanted to say something.

Mr Malkowski: So we are saying only Ontario; what about other provinces and federal information?

The Chair: No, I think the request was the impact particularly on Ontario, but I do not think it was exclusively to Ontario. Am I right, Mr Harnick?

Mr Harnick: Yes.

The Chair: All those in favour? Opposed?

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: Are there any other amendments that fall under paragraph 3? Okay. Then I think the next one would be Mr Winninger's, coming I think under paragraph 4.

Mr Winninger: I suggested adding in paragraph 4, after "opportunities for social and economic stakeholders," "which we presume to include native people;" but it would not hurt to spell it out there.

The Chair: So is that all you wanted to do, "which would include native people," Mr Winninger? The other way to do it would be to place an addition at the end of that paragraph, to say that the committee would invite native leaders or representatives of the native groups to meet with the committee at some appropriate time.

Mr Winninger: I would be content with that, as well.

Mr Bisson: Could we make it a little bit more general, in order to include other groups?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr Bisson: We could say something along the lines that, "We provide opportunity for social and economic stakeholders or their associations and organizations." Something along that line would cover the whole gamut.

Mr Harnick: As I understand Mr Winninger's amendment, it is merely confirmation of what he is going to do for the committee in terms of contacting the various native leaders to help us in our work very specifically. I think the aspect that you are referring to, Mr Bisson, is a given, that the associations and individuals would certainly be the people we were after in terms of the social and economic stakeholders. So I think that is redundant.

The Chair: It includes all the groups, yes.

Mr Harnick: But I think Mr Winninger's request was very specific because he is going to undertake to do that, hope, for us.

The Chair: I think we would actually do it in the normal way these things would be done through the committee, which I presume would be through the clerk's office but certainly acknowledging Mr Winninger's help in bringing that about.

Mr Bisson: What I was advocating is that we expand beyond that. That is all I was saying. That is one of the things we undertook in phase 1 that we were going to do and obviously it is something we want to carry through. But I am saying, expand it past that.

The Chair: I think the problem here might be the words we have got there, because "social and economic stakeholders"—I think they meant to us the people who would be affected by the changes we would be contemplating and that would include a whole variety of people.

Mr Harnick: The only other comment I have about this paragraph is that, as I mentioned before, at the subcommittee level we indicated we would specifically be dealing with the economic ramifications for Ontario if Quebec should decide to separate, and I think that should be indicated clearly in that paragraph, and the paragraph should be amended as such.

The Chair: Sorry, Mr Harnick, you are saying to deal specifically with the economic ramifications?

Mr Harnick: For Ontario if Quebec should decide to separate.

The Chair: I thought we had covered that in your request earlier on.

Mr Harnick: That was just a request for information but I think we agreed that the thrust of what we would be doing in the period between now and the end of June would be studying that specific topic, because we would as I said earlier, be able to do that by having people come here to see us as opposed to our going out to look for the information. We also agreed that it would not be exclusively that topic that we would be dealing with but primarily that would be a focus.

The Chair: All right, let me deal, because we are getting into a variety of suggestions—I will come to you, Mr Beer—with Mr Winninger's amendment first because I think there was agreement. As I understand it, it would be to add that the committee would proceed to invite representatives of the native communities to meet with the committee at some appropriate time. Any discussion on that?

Ms Harrington: I brought that up originally. My feeling, as it has been explained so far, is that it is a little different than the intent of this particular paragraph. As Mr Harnick has said, the intent of this paragraph was to clearly state the consequences to Ontario of the separation in economic terms. My idea, and I believe Mr Winninger's idea, was to have it stated clearly in this paper that it was a priority for us to also meet with native leaders. So maybe that should be in a separate paragraph.

The Chair: Okay, we can do it that way. As I read it, paragraph 4 talks essentially about providing opportunities

or people to meet with us to discuss the ramifications of various changes, and I think we certainly could fit the issue of native rights under that, but equally we can deal with it as a separate paragraph. I do not think it is a big thing.

It seems to me that people are happier if we deal with that as a separate paragraph, which we can do then.

Mr Winninger: I am content.

The Chair: So we will add that in there as a separate paragraph.

Mr Malkowski: My understanding is that at the last meeting we agreed to focus on the native issue in the month of May and then in June look at the economic impact. I am getting a little bit confused. Have we changed our plans, or what schedule are we following?

The Chair: No, I think what we talked about, Mr Malkowski, was trying to deal with those issues some time between now and the end of June. We cannot determine at this meeting today when we are going to do that, particularly if we are talking about inviting people to come and meet with us. We can certainly make some suggestions, but we also need to be somewhat flexible to when people might be available to meet with us. I think the objective was to try to do that between now and the end of June, and on each of these issues to keep working away as best we could, and get as much done as we could between now and the end of June. I do not think I see any change in that.

Mr Beer: It comes back, I think, to Gilles's earlier point that we definitely agreed we wanted to be looking at the different options, including that of the possible separation of Quebec from Canada.

In a sense we were being guided by I forget how many scenarios or potential options that we set out in our interim report. I think we agreed it was important that we made clear to ourselves and everyone that one of those was the possible separation of Quebec, but equally we wanted to flesh out the decentralized federation—become more centralized, asymmetrical—and so it could be that in that paragraph we could note where it says "to advise the committee on the ramifications of possible future changes to the Canadian Confederation," either "as set out in our interim report" or "including," and then list the ones we listed. I think what is particularly new, and from, I suppose, a public information point of view, something we just have not dealt with in this province or in the country, is the issue of potential separation. But we also wanted to look at, in our discussions, what the Allaire report actually means, what the implications would be of the Bélanger-Campeau recommendations and others. I think those were all to be part of that same examination and I think it is just important that people recognize that we are looking at what might be three, four, five options that we are trying for ourselves, let alone for others, to get more fundamental, basic information on.

1700

The Chair: I think it is a useful reminder that in fact people should not look upon this sheet of paper as being the mandate of the committee. We have a document that was prepared by our research staff which details very clearly the various issues that we have identified in our

interim report that fall under these various paragraphs. I think in going back over these issues that document will be guiding us, making sure that we look at all of those various possibilities. In fact, what we tried to do through the subcommittee report was simply to capture the flavour of each of those areas that we needed to explore, but certainly not to try to reset everything else that is there. So the two need to be kept in context, I think.

On Mr Winninger's motion, which will add a separate paragraph, any further discussion? All those in favour? Opposed?

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: I do not know that we now have any further changes to this paragraph, or do we? I think we have taken care of Mr Harnick's concern. Are there any other changes?

Mr Beer: One thing, maybe, as a result of your comments: we might want to append to this the document that was done by research, because that was a good summary of those issues—

The Chair: Yes. Would that be the best way, to make a reference to this?

Mr Beer: I just thought as information.

The Chair: Yes. Okay.

Mr Beer: I can move it if you feel that is necessary, but I just thought it does set out the issues that were raised.

The Chair: I am just checking with the clerk in terms of procedure, because I think it is important that we put that also on the public record so that people would be referring to that as well. So we would attach it as part of the minutes and make that part of the record so it is clear that the course of action set out here refers very clearly to the various issues that were identified in the document from the research staff, which in turn refers to our interim report.

Any other amendments to the subcommittee report?

Mr Malkowski: Where you were talking about networking, then, with the other committees from the provinces in terms of the Constitution, is that addressed anywhere?

The Chair: Yes, that is paragraph 5. "The committee should seek opportunities for informal bilateral discussions with corresponding legislative bodies of other jurisdictions."

Mr Malkowski: Okay, that is good.

The Chair: I think, as Mr Beer addressed this earlier, at this point we should be looking at staying in touch with the various other committees on an individual basis, rather than working towards bringing all those groups together. It may involve meetings with some of those groups and some people from our committee. That is obviously something we need to explore a little bit more and bring back to the committee for further discussion in terms of how best that should happen.

Mr Beer: One thing that I did want to say may speak to Gary's point. Perhaps just a line that indicates our feeling that we would like to proceed with those bilateral discussions initially but we still see the value, once everybody has finished, of the possibility of looking at a larger meeting. I think if you read that cold it might seem as though we had

changed our thinking. I think it is just that we saw a better process. So I wondered, after the period at the end of that paragraph, something that said, "Further consideration to organizing a meeting with all the various legislative committees would be considered."

The Chair: Okay, so you are adding Mr Beer's amendment then? All right. Any discussion on that? All those in favour? Opposed?

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: With respect to paragraph 6 on the committee, if we would do that, I think the understanding is that we would need to move, as people have said, fairly quickly in terms of getting some suggestion about it. We have only talked about it very briefly within the subcommittee, but my sense is that we should move on, perhaps asking for people to give us some proposals as to how we could make it work, then taking a look at it and bringing forward some more specific recommendations to the committee.

But I think we would take it that we would be going forward from this meeting with a general agreement that this was something we felt quite seriously about, that it was worth pursuing in a very serious way and that, although we have not made a final decision on it, it is something we would look at as being quite useful and we would explore it with that intent.

All right, anything else then? On Mr Bisson's motion, which adopts the subcommittee report with all the amendments that have been adopted by the committee: All those in favour? Opposed?

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: I do not know that we have, from our end, any further business. Are there any other items that the committee wish to bring?

Mr Malkowski: Are we in agreement in terms of the schedule? Will we be meeting regularly on Wednesdays or are we going to add another day during the week? It would be helpful if we knew this beforehand, in terms of scheduling.

The Chair: Yes, we have not heard a reply from the House leaders, to my knowledge. I know there were some questions about our request for the evening sittings as well, but I am assuming that has been straightened out.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Is that on the agenda for tomorrow morning?

The Chair: I do not know. You mean, of the House leaders?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes. I will be going to that meeting tomorrow. I could maybe put it.

The Chair: Sure, I have spoken with the government House leader, yesterday actually, and explained the need for us to have those two blocks of time. Again, for people who would be following the proceedings, the committee is intending to meet on a regular basis every Wednesday afternoon and Wednesday evening, recognizing that the Wednesday afternoon sittings would not be carried live because they would be conflicting with the House sitting during that time. They would be taped and rebroadcast at

some later time. I do not know what has been worked out through the broadcast service, but that presumably will be announced through the parliamentary network once a regular time has been worked out. I know there were some suggestions that that be done, perhaps on the weekend, as one possibility.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Was it 3:30 to 6 and then 7 to 9:30?

The Chair: I think that is what we were working on, yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Is that what we were asking for?

The Chair: Yes, essentially that time slot.

Mr Malkowski: I would like to make a suggestion, if we could avoid the Victoria weekend, the long weekend, to give us a bit of a break. Let's try to avoid that weekend.

The Chair: There is a week during which the House is not sitting that starts with that and my assumption is we would not be meeting during that week. If you are going to be meeting I will not be here, so feel free.

Mr Malkowski: So we were talking about the long weekend, that whole chunk of time?

The Chair: Yes. It is with that exception. All right, any other business?

Mr Beer: Next week we would expect to be meeting at 3:30 to 6 and we should plan on 7 to 9, too.

The Chair: You should plan on being here for the evening session as well. The main item next week will be a briefing from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. There may also be some other information that our research staff will have been able to pull together. We have talked, for example, about some of these, going back to the economic issues that we were addressing earlier, that there are some things within the Bélanger-Campeau report, for example, that are of interest to us and we are sorting out the best way to pull that together in a format that is most useful to the members of the committee. So we may or may not be in a position to have some of that ready for the committee members, but as much as we can do, we will.

My sense is that again, we probably should try to pull the subcommittee together if we can, between now and next Wednesday, so that we can proceed with some of the other items to keep the agenda rolling.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Chairman, will you be able to provide a written agenda for that meeting three or four hours ahead of time so we can bring whatever documentation we feel will support the discussion?

The Chair: I hope so. It is one of the things we will discuss once we have had the discussion with the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. We will try to do that through the clerk's office.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Because carrying around paper for this committee can be quite onerous if you do not know what you really need.

The Chair: We will try to keep that in mind. Okay, is there anything else? All right, then we stand adjourned until next week. Thank you.

The committee adjourned at 1710.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 24 April 1991

Organization	C-1109
Adjournment	C-1120

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
 Beer, Charles (York North L)
 Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
 Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
 Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
 Mathysen, Irene (Middlesex NDP)
 Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
 O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa-Rideau L)
 Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)
 Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitution: Carr, Gary (Oakville South PC) for Mr Eves

Clerk: Brown, Harold

Staff:
 Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office
 Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office
 Murray, Paul, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office





C-22 1991

C-22 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 29 May 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Organization

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 29 mai 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Organisation



Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Harold Brown

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Harold Brown

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 29 May 1991

The committee met at 1653 in room 151.

ORGANIZATION

The Chair: I would like to call this meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation to order and welcome new members of the committee who have joined us, particularly Irene Mathysen and Evelyn Gigantes, who have joined the committee.

For people who will be watching us at whatever time this meeting may be replayed over the parliamentary channel, we have obviously had difficulties in having the committee meet because of the proceedings in the House. It seems that those are now resolved and that we are in fact beginning again our regular series of meetings. I should probably just put on the record that we have agreed that we will try to meet on a somewhat regular basis on Wednesday morning and Wednesday afternoons.

We have for this afternoon essentially two items to deal with, one of them dealing with a proposed conference that we have had some discussion about in the subcommittee and, second, discussing and hopefully approving a budget to propose to the Board of Internal Economy, which is meeting, I think, some time next week.

On the first item of the conference, before reading out and placing on the record the report of the subcommittee, by way of reminder to the members of the committee, and again by way of information for people watching us, I just want to reiterate that as part of the process of continuing the consultations that we had decided we would do as a committee, we had asked the subcommittee to look at the feasibility and possibility of a conference to be held some time in the fall.

Again, people will remember that we have agreed and asked and there has been agreement reached to extend the reporting time and the mandate of the committee to the end of October so that our final report, rather than being at the end of June, will be submitted to the House at the end of October. That is in an effort to allow us both the kind of time we will need to deal with the items that we need to in some degree of detail, and at the same time to ensure that we can continue to involve people in discussions with us in that process. Part of that was the suggestion of looking at a conference as a way to involve people in discussing various issues with us, so at this point I will read the report from the subcommittee dealing with that item.

"The subcommittee met on Thursday 2 May 1991 to consider the proposed conference to be hosted by the committee. The subcommittee recommends the following for the consideration of the committee.

Purpose: To provide feedback from representative groups and individuals in the province to assist the committee in its preparation of a final report.

Date: Subject to approval of the House Leaders: September 19-21; Thursday afternoon to Saturday afternoon—that being the week before the House resumes in September.

Location: The subcommittee discussed having the conference either at Queen's Park or outside of Toronto and has not yet come to a decision"—although we do have some additional information, I think, to share with the committee on that since the subcommittee's meeting. "Parliamentary public relations has been asked to provide a preliminary outline of both options for the perusal of the sub-committee.

Who: The committee may want to ensure representation of the following: women, aboriginal groups, disabled representatives, francophones, seniors, multicultural groups, regional representatives"—from the different regions of the province—"youth, academics, business, union/labour"—of course, including also the MPPs.

"In addition, the subcommittee explored the possibility of inviting a number of individuals who do not represent a specific group.

Number: The subcommittee suggests an appropriate number of participants would be between 150-200 people."

That is the report from the subcommittee. I think we probably should have someone move that.

Mr Bisson: I move the adoption of the report.

The Chair: Mr Bisson moves adoption of the report from the subcommittee.

In terms of some of the additional information that we have from parliamentary public relations, Harold, do you want to comment on that?

Clerk of the Committee: Just briefly, some of the information that we have in the report refers to whether at Queen's Park or outside of Toronto. The results of the information we have indicates many of the possibilities outside of Toronto are either fully booked at this point for that period of time in September or they could not commit to us or they could not accommodate the numbers that we have suggested to them. Those are the results of our inquiries. For example, Deerhurst, the Queen's Hotel, Horseshoe Valley and the Pillar and Post Inn in Niagara-on-the-Lake can either not accommodate us or are fully booked. There are some hotels in Toronto that are fully booked at this point in time.

The Chair: Our sense was that we would be able to find space in Toronto, I think, for accommodation and so on.

Clerk of the Committee: Yes, there is accommodation to be had in Toronto, but certainly a suggestion would be that we should commit to it as soon as we can.

The Chair: Okay, so discussion on that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am not really concerned about the location at the moment, other than that it be very accessible

and perhaps be an area we did not touch as broadly as we wanted to when we travelled.

I am more concerned about the whole process. I have been reading whatever I could get my hands on since the last time we met, and that has been some time now. There are a lot of these kinds of things going on across the country, and indeed within our province, and I want to be sure before we endeavour or begin on this path that this is a legitimate activity for this committee.

I know that you are suggesting I am changing course. I have never really spoken in favour of the conference before. I do not think I have said much about this, but first of all I would want to be assured about these representative groups.

It looks to me like we are putting together what I would consider an Ontario constituent assembly. If that is the case, then I think we have to be very certain that it does not become partisan, that it continues to have an air about it that our hearings in the beginning had. I wanted to know what the subcommittee's intentions were regarding representative groups. Are we having invitations to these groups? Who provides the list of people who are invited?

I do not have enough information here to commit myself to this, and therefore I would beg that we have a chance to discuss this within our caucus and delay a decision until we meet again next Wednesday morning. I would like a lot more fill-in at that point.

I know this makes it difficult for locations, and I am not one to procrastinate, but I definitely—and my colleagues agree with me—do not feel we have enough here to say our full intent is in support of this particular suggestion. If you can allay some of my fears right now, that would help.

1700

The Chair: I may or may not be able to, Ms O'Neill. We discussed within the subcommittee some of the same issues you are raising and we have not reached any conclusions on those. I think the sense was that we wanted the conference to be one where we would be able to bring together a cross-section of people who would be representative of the different regions of the province as well as the makeup of the population of the province in the various facets that are outlined here. Hopefully, in the work that we will have done between now and the time leading up to the conference, we will have been able to develop some of the issues that we are looking at in some detail, either with some position papers or some options that we could then put before the people who would be at the conference. In effect, the main objective would be to use the conference as a way to then get some feedback on those and to get some further input for us and then use that information and that input for us to draft our report. That is the kind of thing.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: There are some very big decisions about who would be, for instance, organizing this—we had Alpha Consultants before—big decisions about who the presenters would be, and as you say, whether we should—

The Chair: All of those things have not been decided. All of those need to be sorted out. In fact, one of the things that I have noted for myself to raise was that whole question of how we would go about organizing it. It is clear in

the discussions that the clerk and I have had with the people from parliamentary public relations that they are able to provide us with, I think, in fairness, a fair amount of assistance in terms of the technical aspects of getting the conference together, but certainly my own sense is that we would need some help from some other people who we would need to look at bringing on board. That is my own advice, my own sense to the committee, but we had not discussed in the subcommittee any further than that what we should be doing about that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think it is premature to discuss this when we have not yet met with the deputy minister, nor have we met with our agent in Quebec. You know how I respect the witnesses who came before us, who were people who spoke with their hearts and their heads, but we have not heard any expert at this moment. We know that York is doing a lot of work for this government. So as to how we can decide and say we are going to do something on 19 September and not know what we are going to do, except we are all going to be together in some room, maybe rah-rahing, maybe not, it is very difficult to make this decision. I really do feel the subcommittee has to do more work, or this committee has to do more work, and maybe in speaking to our caucuses we will get more of an idea of direction. Those are my comments, Mr Chair.

Ms Harrington: I feel the direction Mrs O'Neill is coming from. It seems like such a great time since we were together that maybe some of the ground we covered we may have to cover again in coming to these conclusions.

I had two comments: First of all, certainly, I would believe, in the city of Niagara Falls there are quite a few facilities that would be suitable for this size of conference. The date of the 19th I was concerned about. It seemed to me that we had talked about October before. Maybe you could answer, because I thought it was a later date.

The Chair: When the committee discussed this issue before, we were looking at September and October. When the subcommittee looked at this, the September dates and those dates in particular were chosen, or were being suggested, because we felt that it would be useful to try to do it both before the House resumed sitting and, second, if the idea was to use the conference in order to get input that we would then use to put together our final report, if we were trying to get the final report together for the end of October, we wanted to give ourselves at least a month and a bit more time between the conference and that end reporting date.

Ms Harrington: My only concern then would be that because we as a committee have been delayed, it seems like three to four weeks, this date may be difficult to get everything accomplished by the time—

The Chair: I think it is clear that the delay has sort of, as you indicated, caused us to have to go back and re-evaluate some of the things, and that is fine. I think if there are concerns about that, then we could certainly leave some time for people to think about that and perhaps use some of the time today to have some of the concerns expressed, as people have done, and then we could come back to this.

Mr Eves: I share some of Yvonne's concerns and the concerns of Margaret Harrington about the date. I would

suggest that perhaps maybe some time in the next week the steering committee could manage to meet again and talk about some of these issues, because I think they are fairly substantial issues.

First, can we meet that time line now, because circumstances obviously were a lot different on 2 May than they are now?

The meeting that we are talking about—conference, whatever you want to describe it as—does resemble, as Ms O'Neill has said, a constituent assembly. I would think that we are going to have to want to discuss how these groups or representations are chosen. I would think that we do not want to go ahead with that without agreement among representatives of all committee members and certainly all three parties.

I am a little concerned about your statement about the possibility of inviting a number of individuals who do not represent a specific group. I think you are really going to get yourself into a lot of problems doing that. How are you going to choose who these individuals are going to be in a province of nine and a half million, to the exclusion of others?

I have one comment about the budget, and I am not here to criticize Alpha Consultants, but I can tell you that there was some concern by some members of our caucus as to the amount of money that was paid out in the initial committee hearings with respect to consultants. Those concerns were eventually allayed by Mr Harnick and myself. However, I can tell you that I do not think I would be very popular with my caucus colleagues if I went back and said that I agreed to give the committee a blank cheque for \$100,000 to hire any consulting firm—

The Chair: We have not done that.

Mr Eves: No, I am just talking about the amount I see in the proposed budget.

—without knowing exactly what those consultants were going to do and what service they could provide that perhaps intergovernmental relations cannot provide, for example.

Those are just a few of the comments I have. I would think that maybe Ms O'Neill's comments are very appropriate in that, from my point of view, the steering committee—easy for me to say, I suppose, because I am not a member of the steering committee—could perhaps revisit some of these issues between now and next Wednesday and we could have a fuller discussion of them next Wednesday morning, perhaps. Then we could get some input from all of our caucuses on Tuesday morning when we hold our regular caucus meeting.

Ms Gigantes: My concern is that if there is to be a conference, and I understand there was consensus earlier, if we leave it too long, then the physical possibility of getting it together is going to be gone. I think we have to probably say to ourselves that spinning it past next week would be impossible. We would have to have a pretty clear idea of whether it was a go or no-go.

Mr Bisson: I have a little bit of difficulty. I can understand what Mrs O'Neill was saying. Where I have a bit of difficulty is that it seems to me that the idea was brought forward originally by a member of your own caucus. I am

not too sure if that is the way it went, but it seems to me it was an idea that was brought over from the opposition. I only say that because I am a little bit confused at this point in regard to why we are going back.

I would suggest that what we can do to try to work this out is possibly to bring it back to the subcommittee to take a look at it again and just go on from there, rather than keep on discussing it at this point.

1710

Mrs Y. O'Neill: If I might clarify, I think the reason I suggested that I am rethinking is because I have got a lot of new knowledge, much more so than I had as far as what is going on in the rest of the country is concerned and how many conferences are taking place, some within our own city here. I do not want to reinvent the wheel.

I also know that the committee that is being formed in Ottawa will want to have us as part of its meeting as well. I am sure everyone here knows that. We have to make some accounting for our large expenditure. Is this the best way for us to spend our time and our money? I am asking the question now because a lot of things have changed in the last three or four weeks.

Mr Bisson: I respect what you say and to a certain degree I agree. The only thing I thought was happening is that I thought that all of a sudden the whole idea had gotten back somehow and that is why I was trying to clarify a little bit. We had made a decision at one point that we would look at this. A subcommittee was charged with looking at how it could be pulled off. The subcommittee went off and did what it was asked to do and now we come back and we are relooking at it. So if I understand what you are saying, it is that we bring it back to the subcommittee, we look at it in some detail with the members of the subcommittee, looking at some of the concerns that were raised, and from there come back and make a decision as a committee.

Mr Winninger: I am a little disappointed because we did strike a subcommittee many months ago in which we placed a lot of faith to deal with the practical realities of keeping our agenda for this committee going. We did suffer a fairly long setback these past few weeks in not being able to meet. While I can appreciate Mrs O'Neill's concerns that we clarify the nature of this conference that is planned for the fall and ensure that the groups that are represented there are indeed representative, I am a bit concerned that this project has been derailed at this stage. I think the idea was that we wanted the broadest possible democratic consultation here, to circumvent some of the concerns that arose out of the aborted Meech Lake process, and what could be wider—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We have not derailed.

Mr Winninger: Can I complete my train of thought? What could be wider and more democratic than this kind of plenary conference that we were moving towards? I am a bit concerned that suddenly we seem to be derailed from this course and we do not have any constructive alternatives put forward by the members who seem to be opposing the notion of this kind of conference. If I am misinterpreting what has been said, then that is fine. We might go back and look at it a little more closely.

But if at this stage the thought is, "Well, there are other people doing other things and these haven't been specified and that is why we can't do this particular project," then that concerns me deeply, because we had momentum. We had what I thought was a broad, non-partisan interest in answering this mandate that has been conferred on us. Today I am not hearing any constructive alternatives, and I think in the absence of any constructive alternatives we should be looking at the project that has been discussed at length by the subcommittee and seeing how we might improve on that.

The Chair: I think the reality is that perhaps the fact we have not met for four weeks has, at the very least I think, caused us to lose some of the momentum, Mr Winninger, that you have quite clearly identified was there before.

From where I sit, although I know that from the staff end it certainly would make life easier the sooner we make decisions about these things, if it means that in a week's time people's heads are going to be a little clearer about this in terms of either doing it or not doing it, then I do not think it causes a major problem, as far as I see it.

If we go that route and if there are some particular concerns that people have, it would be useful to spend a bit of time now hearing about those so that when the subcommittee meets it is doing that with a basis of understanding of where people's thoughts are at right now, subject, of course, to that changing as well.

Mrs O'Neill, for example, asked the question earlier, and others have made this point, about how this looks like a form of constituent assembly. In some ways, yes, it does. The issue, though, is that if it does, is that good or bad? I think that is the kind of thing it would be useful to hear some comments on.

The other point I would also add is to remind people that we had looked at the conference also as the most appropriate avenue, in our view, to provide that additional layer of input from the public into our process, to which we committed ourselves very clearly. So again I just raise that to keep people's minds on that, that if it is not the conference, then my strong suggestion will be that there has to be some other avenue then for us to involve the public in our continuing discussion, because that, I think, was a very clear undertaking we all made and I think we were all quite serious about.

Mrs Mathysen: I would like to reiterate what Ms Gigantes said in terms of time slipping away. I would support the idea of the conference. I was of the understanding that the purpose of it was to help focus the public's attention on our work to date so that they could have a sense of what the final report would look like.

I think the public is used to first ministers' conferences, all kinds of different conferences, where they do not get a chance to have any input, and I think that this is a significant chance for the public to have an input.

Mr Eves mentioned that there is a possibility some groups would be excluded, but by excluding everyone, I do not see that anything is achieved. So I would like to give support to this idea of the conference once again. I

think it is a very important part of what this committee finally determines when it brings a report to the House.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I just want to say that I do not think I have given the intimation that I want to take this thing off the rails; I think Mr Winninger used the words. I do feel, however, that we on this committee from the very beginning have had to sell this whole process to our various caucuses. Most of them are extremely interested in this issue, and I do not think I can tell them we are having a conference if I do not know how the invitations are going to be placed, what is going to be discussed and whether papers are going to be presented. I do not have any details on this, other than the number of people and a possible amalgam of groups.

I found it very comfortable, for instance, Mr Winninger, to explain to people how we were going to go about relating to the aboriginals because you had a plan. People are very interested in this and they are going to want to look at this budget even more closely now than the first one. So I need more details before we can make a decision and I think I have to have a week to discuss this with members on this committee as well as with our general caucus. As far as alternatives are concerned, maybe we will have to modify this.

The Chair: You do not have any specific thoughts or suggestions that you want to give to us at this point on some of the things we should look at.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I do not feel that I can at this moment. I am sorry.

The Chair: Okay. That is fine.

1720

Mr Offer: I have listened to the discussion and I think we have to put this in some sort of perspective. We had, as I recall—and please correct me—somewhat set a certain staging process for the committee. My recollection is that during this session in the Legislature we were going to hear from a variety of people on a certain variety of issues. I think it was then anticipated that we might have a little bit more of a public hearing stage over the summer, all of which would end up in some sort of—I do not know how to put it—gathering of some kind.

I think it might be necessary for us to step back, without certainly changing course, and take a look at our new time frame. In all frankness, this session is getting very close to completion. We are not going to meet now until June and we are only going to have two or three meeting days. Not that good work cannot be done, but I think we would want to see how our staging of the committee shall progress.

I am not going to speak one way or the other in terms of the 19 September matter, but I do believe it is something which we should caucus with on this particular issue. I do believe we certainly must have a little bit more information on some of the aspects of it. I have a feeling that a lot of these questions that are brought forward today are ones that might be properly addressed first in a subcommittee meeting, then caucused, and then brought back for approval. I do not expect this to be a very lengthy period of time, but I do believe that as we are sitting here and discussing it on Wednesday and not meeting in the evening, the next possible time will be obviously next Wednesday. I think a lot of

good work can be done in that time period to sort of just get us on track again and let us take a look at what our new timetable is.

If September was the anticipated time of this meeting before this delay in our hearings, then it may be that the type of work we had anticipated to be done in that time frame now dictates that this type of meeting is not to be in September or potentially in October. I make no comment on that, save it is a fact that we have set up in earlier meetings some very specific time frames wherein we wanted to do what we all agreed upon was going to be very important work culminating in some sort of gathering.

On that point, however, it had in many ways been my understanding that this type of gathering, when it was first brought forward, was not to take this type of form. I do not say this in a negative sense but rather I think the germ of the idea—and I recall the day of the germ of the idea—was that it would be a gathering of the committees that were travelling the country, the different federal committees, the different provincial committees, having representatives of all of those committees and together sitting around and sharing some of their perceptions, thoughts and opinions on their particular work.

It seems to have evolved into something different, of course, and I think that we have to keep in mind that my recollection is that the initial thought was that this committee would be a gathering of all of the other committees and thereby get a sense as to what is going on around the country. I make that point, and in conclusion say I think what we have to do is sort of take a look at our new time frame and get this thing back on track and try to do it within the next week.

The Chair: I have Mr Eves and Mr Malkowski, and then I am going to see if we can come to a conclusion on this item.

Mr Eves: I am not going to take up that much more time. I agree with what Mr Offer has just said, and I do not think it is much different than what I have said or Mr Bisson said. I am not suggesting that we step backwards. I did not ever suggest, Mrs Mathysen, that we exclude everybody. I said that the last sentence in here mentions "the possibility of inviting a number of individuals who do not represent a specific group"—individuals. How are you going to choose which individuals and how many? Pick a number—117? What about 93? I like the number 93. How about 18? Maybe I have 18 of my constituents who I think should be representative of the rest of the province.

That is just the kind of problem you get into when you start saying we are going to invite—the province has close to 10 million people—so many individuals. How are you going to choose who these individuals are who are not representing a particular interest or a group without offending the other 10,997,000 people in the province? Pretty difficult, I would suggest. That is all I said. I never said that women, aboriginal groups, disabled representatives, francophones, seniors, multicultural groups, etc, should not come. In fact, I said exactly the opposite, unless there is something wrong with my ears or my tongue.

Interjection: It is a matter of opinion.

Mr Eves: Well, my tongue sometimes can get me in a little trouble.

The reality is that for whatever reason, we are three or four weeks behind, and we could debate that and disagree about that for ever. The reality, as the world is, is that the last time I checked my calendar it is 29 May now, not 2 May, and we are three to four weeks behind. Why we are three to four weeks behind is totally irrelevant to how we deal with the logistical problem of solving where we go from here step by step, keeping in mind the steps that we had all agreed we would pursue, and we will do that.

Perhaps the subcommittee or the steering committee should be looking at perhaps now 19-21 September is not realistic. Perhaps after they think about that and come back to us next Wednesday, they will either recommend that it is still achievable and this is how we could do that, or it is not achievable and more realistically we should be looking at the second or third week in October to do this.

The comment that Steve Offer made about the original germ of the idea of a conference I think is quite accurate. I think it was Charles Beer, actually, who offered that suggestion, and it was going to be a meeting of various committees from all over the country. I am not suggesting that this other suggestion is not a good one. In fact, it may be a better one. I just think that the subcommittee or the steering committee should really revisit all of these items in the next week. As I said, that is easy for me to say because I am not on the subcommittee or the steering committee, and I think it is going to be a heck of a lot of work between now and next Wednesday morning. But I think that has to be done so the committee as a whole can come to an agreement and is something we have to do by consensus. We have done everything so far. I do not see any reason why we cannot do this by consensus.

The Chair: I think that has certainly been the intent all along. In fact, the best answer I could offer at this point in terms of who would be selecting the people who would be coming to the conference is that we would use the same approach we have used throughout. When we had in the first stage of hearings a problem with having to decide which groups we would hear and which ones we would not, given the number of groups that came before us, we did it by consensus in the subcommittee. That is the way we work, and that is certainly the way I would hope we would continue to work.

Mr Malkowski: This is to follow up on what Yvonne's concern was in terms of not knowing the definition of where we were going. I think the idea of the conference in the fall was set on—did you have a concern about the timing or was it just the idea of the conference? I am still not quite clear from that. Second, my understanding from our past agreements in meetings was that we were going to hold the conference to take a look at the eight recommendations we had made in our interim report. Is that the focus of what we wanted to do or do we need to redefine the purpose of the conference then?

The Chair: I think, on your second point, Mr Malkowski, that as we discussed in the subcommittee, our sense of the idea of the reason for the conference was that

between now and the time of the conference we would take the issues we identified in our interim report as requiring further study, do some of that further study through a combination of inviting people to come and talk to us, doing whatever research would need to be done on those issues, and then as a result of that, put together perhaps a series of positions or options or more details that would flesh out the various issues that are in our interim report. Then we would place all of that information before the people who would come together at the conference as a way, then, to get the reaction and feedback from them, and then use that information, as I said earlier, to pull together our final report. That is the process as we were looking at it.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: If Mr Malkowski wants me to try and clarify it, I thought I had made it quite clear what my concerns were. I am having difficulty knowing how we would invite members of these groups. Would they be people we have had before whom we did not feel we had heard enough from? I am having trouble determining whether it will all be invitational or whether there will be experts within the province who will want to present papers. Those are the things.

I have certainly not got the impression, as you do, that it would be only our recommendations. I think I have had an awful lot of input on the recommendations. There is no doubt you have, and I am very happy about that. But I think we have to move on to some new concepts now, building on what I consider quite a strong foundation.

1730

The Chair: All right. Let me see if we have agreement, then, to basically defer decision on this item, and therefore on the report of the subcommittee, until next week's meeting, and in the meantime have the subcommittee meet and, as well, allow discussion to happen among the caucuses, and then we will come back to this at next week's meeting.

Mr Bisson: That is agreeable. What kinds of constraints do you have as far as time lines are concerned in being able to book places, and the logistics of this thing? What is the latest we can postpone the decision?

Clerk of the Committee: Currently we have accommodation tentatively booked at a local hotel to accommodate the numbers that are indicated here. The Macdonald Block and some adjoining satellite meeting rooms have been booked for the conference meeting area.

Mr Bisson: So by when would we have to confirm one way or another that we are going or we are not going ahead?

Clerk of the Committee: We would have to be prepared to confirm if we were confronted with the alternative that those other spaces have been asked for and are prepared to be confirmed by some other group.

Mr Bisson: So you would be looking at a decision by, when, mid-June at the very latest, the first week of June?

Clerk of the Committee: I could not put a time on it, Mr Bisson, because if somebody came along to the hotel and said, "We want to book that room tomorrow and we're prepared to put a deposit on it," then we are sunk.

The Chair: All we have done is simply put in a request. There has been no outlay of any money on our part to do that.

Clerk of the Committee: They have indicated that they would call back and say: "We have this other opportunity. Are you prepared to confirm or let it go?"

Ms Gigantes: Can I ask whether it is possible for us to discuss at least in tentative terms what the summer schedule for the committee is likely to be? If people are going back earnestly to consult with our caucuses and there is some notion about how a workload, which was reasonable leading into a September conference previously, now becomes unworkable because we have lost three weeks of meetings and we therefore cannot consider a September conference, I think as far as we can we should try and define what it is we are talking about in terms of workload, what it is that there is left to do before a conference. It will help these discussions. Otherwise we can float around this for another three weeks of meetings and by then the idea will die, not because anybody has killed it but because it has just petered out.

The Chair: Let me try again to refresh people's minds on this, and my own. I think that what we had, in a general way, agreed to was that we should expect to be meeting between now and the end of June on the basis that we have agreed to, and then anticipating that there would be not many, if any, meetings happening during July or most of July. I am not sure what exactly has been worked out or is being worked out among the three House leaders or party whips on that. But then the assumption was that we would be coming back whenever the committee schedule resumes during the adjournment, whether that would be late July or early August and, in effect, be meeting throughout that period, throughout all of August, and into early September.

Ms Gigantes: You mean on a daily basis?

The Chair: Likely on a daily basis during that time, so that we had anticipated that, in fact, the bulk of our work as a committee would be done during the month of August. That was obviously still subject—

Ms Gigantes: We were talking about a much heavier schedule of meetings than this committee has been through.

The Chair: It depends. I think for those of us who went through a month of hearings throughout the province—

Ms Gigantes: But certainly not on the kind of schedule we are looking at, not one day a week.

The Chair: No. Remember we had talked about meeting during the summer break, which meant, in effect, mostly during August and perhaps a little bit of July and a little bit in September. We were talking about, in effect, meeting almost, I would say, on a daily basis during that time, during August and in September, during the time that the House is not sitting. The fact that the House would not be sitting would allow us and, in effect—

Ms Gigantes: As long as we all understand.

The Chair: I think the understanding from our respective party whips and House leaders on this has been that they have been accommodating so far in terms of our requests

for meetings and the kind of scheduling that made this committee a priority over the others in terms of commitments.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: That was certainly understood at the meeting at the beginning of May, that this committee would get priority for the summer sittings.

The Chair: In that context, what we had looked at before was trying to then use the time until the end of June to begin to focus on some of the issues that deal with Quebec's future in Canada and look at some of the economic implications of Quebec's future in Canada and the possibility of separation. The additional item on that was dealing with the question of native issues and trying to invite some of the native leaders to come and talk with us about some of that, realizing that we would be doing the bulk of that also in the summer, but that we might be able to begin at least on those two issues.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Really, the contents of these papers indicate what direction we wanted to begin in.

The Chair: Then let me just again test and see whether we have agreement. Then we will proceed that way with deferring this item for a decision until next week's meeting. People will have a chance to talk in their caucuses and we will try to see if we can get a subcommittee meeting for early next week perhaps. Okay?

Mr Offer: Agreed.

The Chair: Good. If we turn to the next item, the budget, again, it may be that some of the same comments that people have made on this apply, but let me just say to you by way of background that what we have done—"we" being the clerk and I, or essentially the clerk—is put together a draft budget so that we could have something before us. There is, some urgency in at least our putting together some kind of a budget, because the Board of Internal Economy I gather is meeting next week.

Mr Eves: Monday evening.

The Chair: Monday evening. There is probably, I am told, not likely to be a meeting following that. I am not sure.

The word we had been given was to get our budget in even if it was not complete and even if we then required additional budget requests later on. So whether we go for the amounts that are here, whether we reduce them, whether we take some parts of them out, put them on hold, my strong urging would be, let's take whatever we can from here that we can agree to today, let's agree to as much of it as we can and take that forward. Then if there are items that we need to have some discussion about, we can leave those for us to put together a supplementary budget.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I would like to ask some questions about the travel that is here. What planned travel do we have still, or is this strictly for witnesses?

The Chair: What we have is—and again I will ask—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am looking at travel allowances, the one that contains air fare and travel accommodation.

The Chair: Yes. Remember we had talked, as part of our work, that we would in the second phase be looking at staying in direct contact with our counterpart committees

in other provinces. I think in basically some arbitrary way Mr Brown has calculated some rough costs of doing that, of having a few members of the committee travel to other provinces.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So this is interprovincial travel.

Under "Management, consulting and professional services" are "Conference consultants and media relations, \$100,000." There are no decisions made on that. That is an estimate.

The Chair: Those are all rough estimates at this point.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: But you are considering having a formal co-ordinator or firm or whatever involve itself as the others did in bringing forth witnesses.

The Chair: That item, quite frankly, is there at my request because it was my sense that it was better to put that there and put it before the committee. Understand that we have not any decisions about that.

Mr Offer: Is this premised on the conference on the 19th to the 21st?

The Chair: Yes, it is premised on us needing some help with the conference. If we decide not to do it then obviously that item would not be there.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay. Then I just wondered about the conference, the \$200,000. What does that cover? What kind of expenditures?

The Chair: That is on the second page, Mr Brown.

Clerk of the Committee: That is based on the numbers we had reflecting the cost of rooms for delegates for three nights.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We are going to be paying for the delegates.

Clerk of the Committee: Yes, if that is the wish of the committee, but that is the kind of figure that it would reflect—the cost of accommodations and the cost of peripheral needs for the—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: It would be the only conference I would hear of ever in my life, and I have gone to a lot of conferences, where the person sponsoring it pays the delegates' expenses totally.

1740

The Chair: It comes back to the issue of what the purpose of the conference is. If we are inviting people to come to the conference, if the idea of the conference is to have people from across the province come and talk with us, then we are inviting them, and it was on that basis again that I asked that the amount be put in there, subject to whatever decisions we would make about that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So the "Contingency" there just picks up the slack. I think we really have to discuss some of that.

Mr Winninger: Just a question of clarification about the newspaper ads: If this is by invitation and the outreach is done through our consultant, I just wondered what the purpose of the newspaper ads at the bottom would be—the three ads at \$25,000 each.

Clerk of the Committee: Again, it was strictly an estimate of what the committee may feel it requires to get the word out to an advertising system. It depends also on

the use of the ethnic press and the extent of the use of weeklies, which becomes a very expensive and unknown type of thing to establish.

Ms Gigantes: But that assumes that we would not be inviting people, is essentially what you are saying.

Mr Winger: I thought at this stage we had changed things a bit and now we are focusing on consulting with umbrella organizations. I had thought that would be done in a different fashion than earlier when we had to invite people publicly to attend our hearings across the province. Maybe I am wrong in that assumption.

Mr Eves: If I may just make a couple of comments, the Board of Internal Economy meeting is this Monday, but I would be very surprised if there is not another board meeting some time before the committee starts to meet during the summer break. We have often done things by consensus, either by phone or by written documentation that is circulated among all board members if there is some urgency to it. So I just point that out. I am not saying it will not be done Monday night, but if it does not get done Monday night, that is not the end of the road. That is the only point I am trying to make.

The only other point I would make is the one I have already made. If you look at the entire conference package, if you want to put it that way, you are looking at \$100,000 for consultants and media relations, \$200,000 for the conference and another \$100,000 for contingencies. You are looking at some pretty decent-sized numbers. If the steering committee or the subcommittee can sort of get a handle on what we are doing and if they can come to a consensus, then I think surely we can come to a consensus as a whole.

Mr Bisson: Where I am taken somewhat aback by is that we were given direction by a part of this committee as a subcommittee to go back and answer some questions. One of the things that was brought up by the committee, because of the work we did in the first stage, was the whole idea of keeping the public involved in this whole process. I think what people out there recognize is the problem around Meech Lake is that there was no consultation and people felt excluded. I guess why I am feeling a little bit taken aback is that we were asked as a subcommittee to go back and look at this whole idea. The idea was arrived at by members of all caucuses on the subcommittee, and at this point now we are having some disagreement with regard to the whole concept.

I can understand some fine-tuning. I can understand maybe changing some dates. I can understand maybe changing the makeup of what we are trying to do to a certain extent, because the longer we are involved in this, like you said quite well a little while ago, Yvonne, we learn a little bit more and maybe we change our focus somewhat. I do not know if I am reading this right, but what I am reading is that there is some reservation about the whole process of doing this conference.

All I am saying is that as a subcommittee we were charged to go back and look at this thing and to put some numbers around it, make some plans, find some dates, try to find a place to do it and do all of the organization around that. That is basically what the subcommittee did,

and it had members of all caucuses. I do not want to say this facetiously to anybody, but it seems to me that your representatives on the subcommittee should have come back and explained maybe a little bit more what had happened at those meetings rather than being in a position now of debating them for two hours. That is the point I would make.

Mr Eves: You are quite correct.

The Chair: In checking with the clerk, there are probably a couple of things we can do. One is that we can just again defer consideration of the budget until after we have looked at the issue of the conference and looked at—

Mr Eves: If the steering committee reaches a consensus next Monday, then I am prepared to live with that consensus with respect to the budget.

The Chair: Well, that is the other option.

Ms Y. O'Neill: I do not have any difficulty with it either, except I do have quite a bit of difficulty with the delegates' expenses being totally paid. I feel, especially if we are bringing in representative groups, that somebody should be helping us sponsor this. The free-lunch Queen's Park is not part of my scene and I do not think it would do us any good to have a whole lot of people come here and—almost everybody, unless they are presenting a paper at a conference, has to have somebody support them. Even when my teenaged daughters used to go to conferences, they had to collect bottles. To put people up in a Toronto hotel—I know how important this event could be, but it is just not explainable. Even when I go to conferences, I often have to pay out of my own salary. I just do not think it is correct.

The Chair: That was actually the other option I was going to put before the committee, to remove those items on which people had some questions, to take forward the balance and then indicate to the Board of Internal Economy that we are going to come back to it after we had sorted those out. We can go any of those routes, I think.

Ms Gigantes: I would like to say a word or two on this particular subject. I think Yvonne may wish to rethink this, because a number of the people I am sure she would want to see come to such a conference would be people for whom money is a big problem. We do not want to have a gathering of people who can afford to gather. This is an important principle we want to establish. If it means that people who can afford to pay for a hotel room feel like kicking back into the budget, and you want to suggest that fine, but I do not want to see people excluded because of their financial inability to join in. I do not want to see groups excluded because of financial difficulties. I suggest to you that you rethink this.

I am also a bit concerned about meeting at the Macdonald Block. Some of the rooms at the Macdonald Block remind me of a Soviet mausoleum. I am not subject to headaches at all, but when I go into one of those rooms feel like I am in imminent danger of headaches.

The Chair: On that, one of the options we had looked at—and again, we have not drawn any conclusions on those—was to use the Macdonald Block simply for the

large gatherings and then try to use the committee rooms in this place for some of those. That was on the argument that it would be useful to use this building as much as possible for a conference of this nature. The other possibility is simply to use one of the hotels, if we are going to do it in Toronto. None of those have really been finalized yet.

Ms Gigantes: I love the thought of using this building, but there is no large room for that.

The Chair: When we were looking at the Macdonald Block, we were looking also from that.

Ms Gigantes: I wonder if it is possible, during the period when the Legislature is not in session—of course, we are talking about just the last few days before the session begins—to put other chairs in the Legislative Assembly? That does hold 130 very big chairs.

The Chair: The clerk reminds us that is something we would have to take up with the Speaker. But I think the possibilities are there; we could canvass all those.

1750

Mrs Y. O'Neill: If I may respond to Ms Gigantes, I certainly do not want to deny anybody admittance here, but there are rules around here and you know them as well as I. For people who cannot afford to come to present as witnesses, their expenses are paid. I certainly would like us to do that kind of thing rather than say, "Well, if you can afford it, you can pay it back." I think we should keep the same rules we have for the other committees, and if it involves overnight accommodation, fine, but people have to present that they have some kind of need. I also think that several of these groups would like to sponsor their person. It should be an honour to come to talk about this issue.

I do not think making things totally easy and free is always the way to get the best possible participation, whether that be from youth or from adults. Certainly, when we did the food bank hearings we had several groups subsidized from all over the province—mostly their transportation, because they came and went on the same day. I think we should try to stick as close to that as possible. I just feel that we all have to be accountable and I would like to do that as much as possible.

I have a question about the previous budget, Mr Chairman. How did we manage?

The Chair: I will turn to the clerk for any details, but we certainly were under budget, even if not by a lot.

Clerk of the Committee: I think by approximately \$200,000.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: This committee spent two point something already; is that right?

Clerk of the Committee: No, the full budget was \$2 million.

The Chair: So we spent about \$1.8 million. A lot of that, I remind people, also had to do with the fact that we were travelling across the province and that all the hearings were being televised. I say that for the benefit of people who may have forgotten or indeed people who are watching.

Clerk of the Committee: I should also mention that with the last budget some sizeable items which were

provided in that budget could not be paid out of that budget because they were invoiced after the end of the year; printing, I believe, and postage for the distribution of the reports.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Sorry, two people were speaking to me at the same time. There are things that have to be presented in addition to this budget?

Clerk of the Committee: Yes, some of the budget items were not in fact paid during that fiscal year, some of the printing and the postage for distribution.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So what are we talking about, \$500,000?

Clerk of the Committee: No, probably in the order of \$150,000.

The Chair: So what is the sense of what we want to do with this budget? Do we take Mr Eves's suggestion, which is to leave it in the hands of the subcommittee, and if there is consensus there, to take that forward? That was his last word to me as he left, that he is comfortable with that.

Ms Gigantes: Can I say one more thing on the question of accommodation? We all work as elected members here and if we are going to that conference our accommodation gets paid. Of course it is a privilege to come to the conference, but it is a privilege for us to go to the conference too. I think it is fair enough that if we are inviting special representatives from the public who we feel can make special contributions to the process, we look at the question of providing accommodation as a straightforward matter. I am not talking about caviar in hotel rooms or anything of this nature. There is nothing, either, in my view that is unaccountable about this. It is fully accountable. I think it makes eminent sense for us to consider very seriously the payment of expenses of people we invite specially to such a conference. I am not happy that we just put that matter aside as if it has been dealt with at this stage.

The Chair: My sense was that if people wanted to have a chance to think about it some more, it might facilitate the discussion that way. Obviously, if there is no resolution in the subcommittee, the only solution is for us to bring it back to the committee to be resolved here.

Mr Offer: Without getting into the specifics of what is contained in the budget, it seems we have a question before us, whether we move this discussion on the budget to the subcommittee to obtain consensus, if possible, or move this budget to the next full meeting of this committee. I would think we do not really have—

The Chair: Or approve parts of the budget and send that—

Mr Offer: I do not know if we have that particular latitude at this point, as Mr Eves had to be called away. I recognize it could be done, but I do think that as a matter of courtesy we would not do that. I would think at this point the question is whether we put the budget to a subcommittee or to the next meeting. We would have no problem in moving it to the subcommittee for consensus.

The Chair: The understanding is that we will try to resolve it there. If there are some problems, we will, as I say, bring them back here to the committee.

Ms Gigantes: Am I correct in understanding that there is an interest in having both the question of the conference and the question of the budget discussed with each party caucus, which occurs on Tuesday—am I correct?—which means that either this work gets done by the subcommittee tomorrow or Monday, or it does not get before the—

The Chair: No, my understanding is to try to get a meeting of the subcommittee together, hopefully for Monday, so we can have some discussion there, and then people can take that discussion and have whatever further discussions need to happen, and then we come back on Wednesday.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Is it correct that you will have to take this budget forward Monday night?

The Chair: If people are comfortable with leaving it so that if there is agreement within the subcommittee, we could then take that forward that evening, we would do that. Otherwise, we would bring it back.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I have no trouble with the final amount. I do have some trouble and I am still having difficulty being totally convinced by Ms Gigantes, so that

item is not solved, obviously. But the total amount I have no difficulty with if you take it forward.

The Chair: That helps, if that is the same from Mr. Eves and the Conservative caucus.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: He wants to talk about the subcommittee Monday.

The Chair: Then we may not have a problem in that sense. If we are talking about particular expenditures but not the total amount, that is a different matter. I think we can still deal with the time lines of the Board of Internal Economy and still leave us flexibility in the committee to deal with the issues.

Mrs Mathyssen: Might I say that if the work this committee does effects a reconciliation in this country between Canadians, I would suggest that this amount of money in this budget is a very paltry sum, if that is achieved.

The Chair: On that note, we stand adjourned until next Wednesday.

The committee adjourned at 1759.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 29 May 1991

Organization	C-1123
Adjournment	C-1132

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)

Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Gigantes, Evelyn (Ottawa Centre NDP)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Mathysen, Irene (Ms)(Middlesex NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa-Rideau L)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitution: Curling, Alvin (Scarborough North L) for Mr Beer

Clerk: Brown, Harold

Staff:

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Service

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Service



Ontario

C-23 1991

C-23 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 12 June 1991

Select committee on Ontario in Confederation

Organization

Ministry of Intergovernmental
Affairs

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 12 juin 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération

Organisation

Ministère des Affaires
intergouvernementales



Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Harold Brown

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Harold Brown

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 12 June 1991

The committee met at 1017 in room 151.

ORGANIZATION

The Chair: I call the meeting to order and welcome you to this meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We have a couple of items we need to deal with in public session in terms of discussing and hopefully approving our budget, as well as receiving a briefing from our research staff on a conference that was attended recently. I think after that, my suggestion from the chair and as the result of some discussions this morning at the subcommittee would be that we then go into private session to continue the planning work we have been doing in terms of the next stage of our work. Because of the relative detail we need to get into, I think it is useful to do that in private session.

We have put before you a proposal of the budget. We should point out that this morning we had a meeting of the subcommittee, and the total amount of the budget that is coming forward as a result of that discussion is still the same, that is, \$1,056,264.

We would suggest a change. As you recall, we had some discussion around the conference—here last week and prior to that and also in the subcommittee. We have taken the contingency item, the \$400,000 we had placed there pending our discussions on the conference, and are suggesting we break that down, most of it dealing with the conference, \$300,000 of that—\$100,000 dealing with costs of accommodation, \$100,000 to cover travel costs for people who would be attending the conference and the other \$100,000 to deal with consultants' fees in terms of some decisions we still need to discuss and make around that—and then the remaining \$100,000 would be a contingency item for the whole budget, which is a normal amount, a normal percentage in terms of a budget of this size. That is the proposal as we discussed it this morning.

We had a little bit of discussion around the issue of people attending the conference and what we would be doing in terms of covering their costs, and our sense is that if we follow the standing order that exists for witnesses appearing in committees, which in effect basically says that people can have their costs recovered if they request that, our sense would be to make people aware of that. Then that should cover any situations where people in fact require assistance. That is something we can work out in more detail as we go into the planning of the conference. That is the sense coming from the subcommittee in terms of the budget. We will put it before you and ask for any discussion on that.

Ms Gigantes: I find that a foolish policy. I cannot imagine a person coming to the conference who could request to have travel and accommodation costs paid not doing that. I think we might as well simply state that we are paying.

The Chair: In effect, I think we would be saying the money would be there. The reality might be that for some of the people who are coming, if they are attached to particular organizations, for example, they might be able to cover the costs or some of the costs. The amount is there. We have budgeted for it. Our sense is that we can cover the costs of all of the delegates, all of the people who would be coming to the conference within that budget if that is necessary. We would certainly be making it clear—I think there was agreement on that—to people who would be invited to come that the funds are there and so it is a question of whether people would use them or not.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I do feel that it is comforting to the people to know that there are standing orders in place in this Legislature that account for this as a regular matter of habit and routine and under which they would be applying for assistance. We have to have some accountability and that, I think, is built into the Legislative Assembly and should be used.

Mr Winninger: This question harks back to one I asked earlier. At the bottom of page 1 of the budget is advertising, three newspaper ads at \$25,000 each. Given that we are, I thought, planning to meet with various organizations and go through a selection process for delegates at the conference, are we going to be advertising this conference in the paper? Is that what this is directed to?

The Chair: I am not sure. Mr Clerk?

Clerk of the Committee: It is up to the committee whether it wants to advertise or not.

The Chair: I think it is something we would have to look at. The amount is there in the event that we choose to use it for that or for other advertisement purposes.

Mr Winninger: I see.

The Chair: But we have not made decisions to spend any of those funds at this point.

Other questions or comments? All right, we need a motion to approve the budget.

Mr Bisson: I move that we adopt the budget.

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: All right. The second item that we want to deal with then is that, as you know, a conference took place in Kingston last week or the week before dealing with economic dimensions of constitutional change. I think there has been an outline of that distributed to the members. Alison Drummond from our research staff attended that on our behalf and we have asked her to give us a very brief overview of some of her observations of the conference. I think some of the papers from the conference will be distributed to the members of the committee. As well, we are looking at bringing some of the people who

participated in that conference to speak to the committee at future meetings.

Ms Drummond: I have distributed the press coverage that I have been able to get—there may have been coverage in the Kingston Whig-Standard, but it is not yet at the library—which is useful. The members may want to look at that.

Rather than give an overview of the themes of the conference, which I thought the media stories did do, I distributed the agenda and I will just quickly go over a little bit about what each paper said. I have copies of all the papers with the exception of Pierre Fortin's one in session 6 on the economic consequences of a sovereign Quebec, which I should be receiving in the next few weeks.

The first paper, the Economic Dimensions of Constitutional Change: A Survey of the Issues, was very upbeat, actually an overview of the issues that the conference was going to be dealing with, making the point that Canadian federalism has been quite economically successful in the past, and that the political reorganization that almost certainly is going to be taking place can be seen as an opportunity to improve Canada's position in the world economy.

The second paper, which Professor Courchene gave, as the title suggests was more pursuing ideas than presenting a thesis on what he thinks will happen or should happen. A number of the ideas raised in the paper may be of interest to members, particularly his statement that Canada in the late 20th century, after the free trade agreement and other economic changes, is bound much more east-west by social policy and shared values than by strong east-west economic ties.

Another point he made that raised a lot of interest among questioners was the idea that over the last several years the economic policies pursued by the government of Ontario have not been the same as those pursued by the federal government and that the Ontario economy is large enough that this is affecting the national economy. He thought it is a trend that is actually likely to continue.

The third paper, The Design of a Government for an English Canadian State, assumes the separation of Quebec and argues that the rest of Canada—ROC, as they called it throughout the conference—should be a strongly unitary state, without a provincial level of government.

The paper Canadian Choices was written by somebody who presented to the Bélanger-Campeau commission, and it is essentially an expansion of the paper he gave to the Bélanger-Campeau commission, arguing for a federal system but with guarantees of political and economic freedom. One of the things he was arguing was for dropping the "notwithstanding" clause to protect minorities in the provinces and in the country.

Mr Brown: Excuse me. That is under Canadian Choices?

Ms Drummond: Yes.

In the fifth paper, The Allocation of Tax Authority in the Canadian Federation, the authors were essentially working with the proposals of the Allaire report, and argued that a shift of expenditures to the provinces will require a significant shift of taxing powers. They suggested

some tests for which level would appropriately be taxing—tying taxation expenditures more closely.

Some Economic Aspects of Political Restructuring, which was the sixth paper given, argued that moving towards much greater provincial powers will lead to greater centrifugal forces in the country and essentially the creation of a series of small states. One of the things that this paper really emphasized was the question of labour mobility which, these authors argued, would not survive a lot of political decentralization.

The seventh paper, The Constitution and the Social Contract, also was emphasizing this question of labour mobility. They argued that Canada has been a relatively decentralized federation that has been quite successful, but the federal government must have powers to deal with the economic efficiency of the country and equity within the country, specifically transfer payments to less-well-off provinces and, again, labour mobility.

1030

The Division of Powers in Canada took an approach dealing with languages, human capital, and argued that this would be a useful test for what powers should go to Quebec: essentially all powers dealing with human capital, language, culture, retraining and certain social policies.

The ninth paper, called Piecemeal Decentralization, was a case study of environmental regulation. Basically, what it said was that there are economic reasons for decentralizing environmental regulation but political reasons for centralizing it.

The 11th paper was given by Pierre Fortin. That is the one I do not have a copy of. He argued, contrary to some of the other people giving papers at the conference, that economic federalism is not working, and assuming that Quebec does decide to leave the federation, he was arguing that it will have a real incentive to negotiate assets and liabilities in order for it to have credibility in the international finance markets. He concluded that the cost of separation would be significant but manageable, though he did, at the same time, say that a lot of the economic assessments of this sort of issue are not dictated but affected by the political views of the people arguing them.

The 12th paper, Are Bigger Countries Better Off?, used the idea of economic convergence, which is usually used to deal with how quickly countries are catching up with each other. It used some numbers within Canada, treating the provinces as countries. It was very cautious, and actually did not really make any predictions but argued that, generally, greater trade and mobility of ideas tends to improve the economic positions of countries, not an entirely surprising conclusion.

Mr Bisson: I am not sure I understand. He argued that the larger the country, the better the possibility of developing economic trade?

Ms Drummond: He did not argue even that, but he argued that small countries are better off if they have more open borders.

Mr Bisson: Interesting.

Ms Drummond: The 13th paper, on the Bank of Canada, was dealing with some ways of getting regional

representation in the Bank of Canada. He argued that there are a lot of issues being dealt with in constitutional negotiations, and this may not be at the top of the list, but that a good deal of regional representation can be gained without constitutional changes.

The 14th paper, on financial regulation, was one of the more technical papers given at the conference. If people are interested in this issue, I can give them a copy, but it was arguing that responsibility for financial institutions is presently split between federal and provincial levels of government. That may not be a particularly good way to do it.

The 15th paper, Alternative Divisions of Federal Assets and Liabilities, took three approaches to this issue, one proposed by the Bélanger-Campeau commission, one essentially on Quebec's share of the population, and a third based on historical benefits.

One of the interesting things about this paper, which was a sort of theoretical paper, was that the questions asked when they talked about "fair" or "proportionate" or "disproportionate" would always take the population share as a norm. That seemed to be one of the conclusions from the questions.

Finally, the 16th paper, called The Quebec Sovereignty Scenario, argued that true customs union requires a good deal of political union and that with political decentralization the economy is likely to become more decentralized. Professors Smith and Lipsey also argued that this may be a reason to create a more positive agenda of removing internal trade barriers to create more political unity.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: May I go back a bit? I would like to ask a little more about paper 15. Was that a technical paper? Were there specifics about major federal government buildings or facilities, or was it much more general?

Ms Drummond: It is really a preliminary exploration of what the numbers would look like for the various regions of the country, taking each of these three approaches, this modified Bélanger-Campeau approach, which based a lot of it on which assets were already in Quebec. But it is very preliminary. What became really clear was that this "historical benefits" approach would penalize the Maritimes very substantially. That was something people were a little uncomfortable with. The Bélanger-Campeau and the per capita approach actually were not all that different.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You said in the beginning—I had trouble catching on. Is it 2 or 3 that talks more about the Ontario economy having developed somewhat parallel? Was it Courchene or Usher who got on to that topic?

Ms Drummond: It was Courchene. What he was arguing was that the economic policy that has been pursued by the province over the last several years has been diverging from the economic and monetary policies pursued by the federal government.

Mr Bisson: I would like you to go back to points 9 and 13 very quickly, please, and give a little recap.

Ms Drummond: Paper 9: At present, jurisdiction over the environment is divided between federal and provincial governments, and it was looking at how that responsibility might be divided. It was a case study using an economic approach. Using an economic approach, he would argue

that responsibility for the environment should be decentralized to the provinces, but at the same time there are political reasons why people would prefer to see it centralized. It did not make any recommendations particularly.

Mr Bisson: Can you expand a little on Constitutional Reform and the Bank of Canada?

Ms Drummond: What this author argued was that the Bank of Canada has been quite successful in reaching its goal, if its goal is defined as limiting inflation, but at the same time there is public perception that the bank needs regional representation, so he was exploring some ways that might be done.

Ms Harrington: I do not know where to start. I do not know how you can try to get two or three days into 10 minutes. Impossible.

Ms Drummond: I hope I have.

Ms Harrington: You were mentioning just now regional representation on the Bank of Canada. Are you implying in any way that the policy should be different in different regions to aid their economic situations?

1040

Ms Drummond: The paper does not particularly address that. In the discussions around that issue, there was quite a consensus that is not really possible in an economy like Canada's.

Ms Harrington: The policy, whatever it is, has to be totally national in scope.

Ms Drummond: Yes.

Ms Harrington: So when you say regional representation, you just mean people from various parts of the country on the Bank of Canada.

Ms Drummond: Yes. He actually used the examples of Germany and Switzerland. The regional level of government has made appointments to the board of governors of the central banks in those two countries, so he explored how that works. Essentially, it is more a means of information, informing the bank and the bank informing the regions of reasons for the monetary policy pursued rather than very substantial policy input.

Ms Harrington: I just have a few other quick questions, then I hope to read over what you have given us to try to get more out of it.

You were talking about the relationship of Ontario's economy to the national economy. How far back does it apply, that Ontario influences the national economy?

Ms Drummond: This is Courchene's paper you are addressing?

Ms Harrington: Yes.

Ms Drummond: I would prefer to give you the paper. I am not entirely clear on the argument.

Ms Harrington: That, of course, now is very topical, about the different directions. I was just wondering how far back that went and how in the past the different economic policies may have played against each other or towards each other.

You mentioned labour mobility. Could you clarify what that means?

Ms Drummond: Being able to move from province to province for work without restrictions.

Ms Harrington: With qualifications, say, with regard to nursing or teaching or various things like that?

Ms Drummond: It was less that, as of course there is not complete labour mobility in those terms, than the existing labour mobility, that people do not need permission to move from province to province to work.

Ms Harrington: One last question: How many of these papers were given by women?

Ms Drummond: From the first names, it looks to me as if there were none. There were very few women there.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Regarding the labour mobility, was there discussion at all on that paper about work permits between provinces or regulations regarding those permits?

Ms Drummond: No, not at all.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So it was strictly an actual physical mobility of transferring centres of industrial development?

Ms Drummond: No, the papers that addressed labour mobility were simply saying it was a good thing rather than talking about the details. What they were talking about was people's ability to move within the federation to look for work, rather than economic development policies.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So what is it? You say it is an easy thing, but right now it is not an easy thing. Plumbers cannot necessarily transfer their papers and this kind of thing. Did they get that specific?

Ms Drummond: No, they did not get that specific. I think the argument would be that interprovincial barriers to labour mobility are not a desirable thing.

Mr Malkowski: Any discussion on the native control of the economics of government?

Ms Drummond: None at all.

Mr Bisson: You say you have all the papers. I would like to get number 2 with regard to the east-west ties. I take it what he was arguing is that the ties are becoming more on social issues than economic.

Ms Drummond: Yes, the metaphor he used was the railway, that the east-west rail line is of social policy and shared values.

Mr Bisson: And basically arguing that the trade is north-south rather than being east-west as it was designed.

Ms Drummond: Yes.

Ms Gigantes: Am I correct in assuming that we will get a set of the papers?

Ms Drummond: We were discussing that, and the clerk will be distributing them.

Ms Gigantes: That is fine. While I am at it, is it possible for us to get quickly a copy of the report given by the so-called group of 22 to the Premier yesterday?

Mr Bisson: It was reported this morning in the Star. Basically, it was a group of 22 people who put forward some propositions in regard to where we are going.

The Chair: We can take a look at that. Obviously, unless it is a private document, we should be able to get that.

Thank you, Ms Drummond, for that overview. In addition to distributing the papers, we will also look at the usefulness of having some of the people who presented here come and talk to the committee, and we will be discussing that, both within the committee and the subcommittee.

Unless there are other items that members of the committee wish to raise in public, that probably concludes the public session for us this morning. My suggestion would be for us to go off the record and continue the discussion of the planning of the next session. There are a number of other points, technical things we need to work out. As people know, we will be receiving this afternoon a briefing, which will be in public, from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, bringing us up to date as to where things are across the country and giving us that kind of overview.

Unless there are any other things people want to raise, we will need a motion to go into closed session.

Mr Bisson: I so move.

Motion agreed to.

The committee continued in camera at 1047.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1553 in room 151.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. For the people who might be watching us at some point this week over the parliamentary network, I welcome them to this meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation.

As members of the committee know, we have as the main item of business this afternoon a briefing from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. Before we begin with that and before I turn over to our guests, there are just a couple of very quick items of business we need to do.

The first two things deal with conferences. Last week or the week before, we were given a notice of a conference happening at Osgoode Hall Law School from 23 to 25 June. I think today members were given a notice of a meeting that has been organized by the Canadian Bar Association—Ontario for Tuesday 18 June. I just want to remind members of the committee, if they are interested in attending either or both of those, to let the clerk know and he will make the appropriate registration.

The other thing is that you should have received a draft of a summary regarding the conference, which we can hopefully have a look at before our meeting ends today. It is a draft that the clerk prepared in response to requests earlier today.

Last, because of the ever-changing nature of the membership of this committee, we need to have a motion formally changing the makeup of the subcommittee. Mr Beer, of course, is no longer a member of the committee. I think what would be in order would be a motion replacing Mrs O'Neill for Mr Beer on the subcommittee.

Mr Offer: I will move it.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTRY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Chair: We turn now to the briefing. We are happy to have a number of people with us today, but I think what I will do is turn to Chris Bredt from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs and ask him to introduce the folks who are with him.

Mr Bredt: My name is Chris Bredt. I am the assistant deputy minister of constitutional affairs and federal-provincial relations with the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. On my right is Debbie Gillis, who is an officer with the intergovernmental affairs department, and on my immediate left is David Cameron, who is a former Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and is currently a professor of political science at the University of Toronto. To my far left is Tone Careless, who is the acting director of constitutional policy with the Ministry of the Attorney General.

I thought I would just give you a quick idea as to what we propose to do here for you today. I will be giving you an update on what has been happening across the country and at the national level with the various different processes. There are a large number of those ongoing. I will just try to give you a quick feel for who they are, what they are doing, what they have done and when they propose to

do it. Tone Careless will then give a general review of where we have come from in terms of amending the Constitution, the hits and the misses. Finally, David Cameron will talk about what is at stake in this round of constitutional negotiations.

Let me begin with a bit of an overview as to the processes that are ongoing in the various provinces and with the federal government. There are now committees or commissions in almost all 13 jurisdictions, including the territories. There are none yet in Saskatchewan or Newfoundland, but both of these provinces have announced that they will be creating some sort of process. There is a federal commission and a parliamentary committee now operating and there will be an additional one commencing this September. There is one Quebec committee and one commission which have completed their work and two new legislative committees that are likely to be created in the near future.

The trend is towards legislative committees. There have been some exceptions to that. For example, the Spicer commission was appointed members, and in Quebec both of those processes had a mix of legislators and other individuals.

In terms of what is happening at the federal level, most of you will be familiar with the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future, better known as the Spicer commission. It started its work last November and it had a broad mandate to solicit public views and to attempt to develop some sort of consensus. There were 12 members appointed from the general public to represent different regions and interests. There was an initial session of briefings by experts. Since that time there has been a mixture of large and small public meetings, televised meetings, school meetings, 1-800 telephone lines, information kits, small group sessions—a wide range of activities designed to involve the people of Canada. An interim report was delivered in March of this year and the final report is expected at the end of this month.

The second process that the federal government has ongoing is the Beaudoin-Edwards committee. It was also established in December of last year. It was composed of five senators and 12 members of Parliament from all parties, and its mandate was to look at the amending process only. The committee started with a discussion paper that focused in particular on things like constituent assemblies and referenda. There were two weeks of expert witnesses in February. There were public hearings in March and April, and a final round of hearings from experts in early May. The report is expected to come out by the end of the month as well.

Issues that were raised by the witnesses included such things as process issues like changes to the amending formula, legislative requirements either federally or provincially, and referenda. Constituent assemblies were very much discussed and initially there was even some talk of extra-constitutional types of approaches.

1600

Witness included some governments; for example, the Northwest Territories, the Yukon, British Columbia and

Newfoundland made presentations to the committee. A large number of academics and a wide range of interest groups including charter groups, francophones, the multi-cultural community, women and aboriginal people appeared in front of them, and some private citizens as well.

The new process that has been announced by the federal government involves another parliamentary committee. The full details have not yet been provided but it is clear that the members will include both senators and members of Parliament. There is also the notion that there are going to be some panels, in particular an aboriginal panel that will act as a consulting body to this group. Again the details are somewhat sketchy because the election for the Assembly of First Nations leadership has been ongoing and there has been some difficulty in terms of sorting out exactly how that should be structured.

The mandate, which was clearly described in the throne speech, was to hear the views of men and women across Canada and for each jurisdiction to hold public sessions with a counterpart legislative committee, or with legislators if no committee had been struck. It will also be meeting with aboriginal groups. The discussions will be based upon a new federal proposal. The indications are that this proposal will be tabled early in September and will be distributed quite broadly across the country. The purpose of this federal proposal will be to start discussions across the country.

In Quebec there were two processes that are now completed, both of which I am sure you are familiar with. The first was the Allaire committee established in the summer of 1990 by the Liberal Party of Quebec immediately after the failure of the Meech Lake accord. It held hearings across the province primarily involving members of the Liberal Party, and reported in February. The report dealt primarily with a substantive approach that the Liberal Party should adopt. It was nominally federalist but recommended some very major changes to the federal institutions and powers: 22 powers were listed that ought to be transferred to Quebec's exclusive jurisdiction. Also, quite significant recommendations with respect to restructuring federal institutions such as the Supreme Court and the Canadian economic union and process types of issues essentially suggested that Quebec should receive offers from the rest of the country. If the offers were not adequate, a referendum on sovereignty should be held by late 1992. It was approved by a large majority at the Liberal convention in March of 1991.

The second process was the Bélanger-Campeau commission, which was also established in the summer of 1990 after the failure of Meech Lake accord. It was a mixed commission involving both legislators and appointees that held very extensive hearings throughout Quebec during the fall of 1990 and delivered its report this March.

Five important themes emerged from the Bélanger-Campeau report: first, that the status quo was not acceptable; second, that Quebec would be deciding its own future; third, that they saw some difficulties in reconciling Quebec's distinct identity and vision within Confederation; fourth, that there had to be a reduction of overlap between provincial and federal jurisdiction; and fifth, that lasting

solutions had to be found quickly. This debate had gone on for too long.

Two options were offered. One was a renewed federalism and the second was sovereignty. The recommendation was that two legislative committees should be established; one to study sovereignty and the other to examine or review offers of renewed federalism. A sovereignty referendum was recommended by October 1992.

There were a number of addenda to the report that took the form of comments by a number of the signatories. Perhaps the most important of these were the comments by Premier Bourassa, Gil Rémillard, who is the Minister of Justice and Intergovernmental Affairs in Quebec, and Claude Ryan, who is now the Minister of Public Security, I guess, but who as you know was formerly the leader of the party and quite a significant influence. They made it quite clear it was their view that the elected government retain the right to determine the process, notwithstanding the recommendation of the report.

There were also comments by federalists who complained that the assessment of Canada, past and future, was not in accordance with their view as to how the federation had run and from sovereignists who felt that, in view of the witnesses they had heard, the report really should have endorsed sovereignty.

What is happening in Quebec now? A bill was introduced in May that essentially followed the recommendations of the Bélanger-Campeau report, that is, that two committees would be formed. One was a committee to examine matters relating to Quebec becoming sovereign and to study all aspects, economic, legal and international and also to consider offers of economic partnership with Canada. The second committee was to examine any offer of a new constitutional partnership—in other words, offers coming from the balance of the country.

The bill was withdrawn temporarily. It is unclear whether it is going to be reintroduced. The bill also set two days for a possible referendum, one in July and the other in October. Currently, I guess there are discussions going on in the Quebec Legislature as to what will happen with respect to the bill.

Turning to the balance of the country, then, I will just proceed from east to west. In Newfoundland there is no committee or commission currently. In fact, Premier Wells had indicated he was not in favour of having a provincial committee. However, following a recent meeting with Joe Clark, Premier Wells indicated he would be establishing a legislative committee so that he could participate in the federal process. The Premier has made presentations to the Beaudoin-Edwards committee, where he focused on his views with respect to constituent assemblies and referenda and also on changes to the amending process.

In Prince Edward Island there is a standing committee on constitutional reform. In the March throne speech the government promised to establish the committee. There is no public discussion paper. Advertisements have been placed in local newspapers asking interested groups and individuals to appear before the committee. The hearings began in late May and are continuing into June and a report is expected by the end of August.

1610

In Nova Scotia a working committee was announced last week. Members were appointed as representative of Nova Scotia's linguistic, cultural, aboriginal, business and academic communities. The chair is Eric Kierans, the former federal cabinet minister. The government will be providing a discussion paper to the committee. The committee's process is to include receiving written submissions, toll-free telephone lines and public hearings that will start in September. The committee is to report in November.

In New Brunswick, a commission on Canadian federalism was established in September of last year. It is a mixed commission of nine legislators and a number of appointees. Its mandate, first, is to recommend how the federation may be strengthened to serve Canadians living in New Brunswick; and second, to examine the state of the federation and recommend means through which the federation can be renewed.

A discussion paper was released in February 1991. There had been interviews with selected groups and citizens carrying on into June. There is the possibility of an interim report in August or September of this year. Public hearings have been scheduled for the fall, with a final report expected late this year or early in 1992. New Brunswick intends to request that both the legislators and the appointees on the committee meet with the federal parliamentary committee. In terms of other activities in New Brunswick, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs made a presentation to the Beaudoin-Edwards committee with respect to the amending formula.

I dealt with Quebec, and we all know what we are doing here in Ontario, so I will skip over to Manitoba.

In Manitoba, a task-force on the Constitution was established in the late fall of 1990. It is an all-party task force that includes the Minister of Justice and is chaired by Professor Fox-Decent, who is a professor of political science at the University of Manitoba. Its mandate is to study Senate reform, especially the triple E Senate; charter, aboriginal, gender and multicultural rights; the amending formula and process; division of federal and provincial powers; overall constitutional priorities; and proposals from other jurisdictions. A number of public hearings were held during the winter. An interim report was prepared by the chair in March 1991. Its final report is expected this summer.

In Saskatchewan, plans for a constitutional committee or commission have been announced, but there has been no further activity to date. In terms of other factors, Saskatchewan recently introduced a law to allow, but not to require, referenda on constitutional amendments.

In Alberta there is a select special committee on constitutional reform. It began following the failure of Meech in the summer of 1990 as a task force of seven government members of the Legislative Assembly. It is chaired by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. There were four sessions held with experts during the fall of 1990. A public discussion paper was released in February of this year. It has now been formally expanded to become an all-party committee. Public hearings began in late May. A report, although originally due for 1 July, is now scheduled for later in the fall.

In British Columbia there is a cabinet committee on the renewal of federation. It was established in December 1990. A discussion paper was released in March 1991. The committee is chaired by the Premier. Its mandate is to put forward proposals that will ensure an equitable and rational federalism that is fair to all regions, but with a particular focus on the practical realities of governing a regionally diverse federation; federal restructuring to lessen the dominance of central Canada and reduce federal-provincial waste and duplication; and more effective and appropriate ways for citizens of the province to have their views and values reflected in the Constitution.

The 7 May throne speech announced the creation of a select committee of the Legislature. In addition to that, there has also been a referendum law passed in British Columbia that permits referenda to be held on major issues, including formal constitutional amendments.

Turning to the territories, each one has a process under way. In the Northwest Territories it is a select committee on Constitutional reform. It was created in March 1990 during the Meech process and is chaired by the Minister of Justice. The members are the Minister of Aboriginal and Constitutional Affairs and three members of the Legislative Assembly. It has prepared and delivered submissions to both the Charest committee, which had cross-country hearings prior to the first ministers conference in June, and to Beaudoin-Edwards.

In the Yukon there is a select committee on Constitutional development, again created in May of 1990. There is one member each from the government and the opposition. A public discussion paper was released in May of last year and public hearings took place in March of 1991. A report was issued in late April of this year which contained a summary of the public views heard but did not contain any recommendations. Premier Penikett has made representations to the Beaudoin-Edwards committee, focusing on northern and aboriginal participation in the amending formula as well as a number of other topics.

I think that is a quick rundown on what has been happening with your counterparts across the country. I think, as you can see, that most committees are in the process of carrying on and looking at the types of issues you are looking at. I will end the presentation there and ask Tone to speak. I think the thought was that we would take questions after we had completed all of the presentations, if that is—

The Chair: If that is acceptable to people; I did see a few hands go up. Are people okay with waiting until the presentation is over? Mrs O'Neill, you would rather have some questions now?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: That is pretty heavy stuff. I think it would be nice to be able to ask after each presenter.

The Chair: All right. Is that okay if we do it that way?

Mr Bredt: Sure.

The Chair: Okay, then. Mrs O'Neill, go ahead.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I just have a couple more, to go back to Bélanger-Campeau because you really did condense that quite tightly and I am happy about that. The third point

you mentioned was the difficulty in reconciliation. Could you expand a bit on that point?

Mr Bredt: The view of the Bélanger-Campeau commission, in terms of reconciling the distinctiveness, was some skepticism, given that the "distinct society" clause in Meech had been one of the major elements in the failure of Meech, whether in a future round that distinctiveness could be achieved. I think that was the thrust of the concern. They felt this was essential to Quebec as part of an overall constitutional package, some skepticism as to whether it could be achieved in view of what happened in the Meech process.

Ms Y. O'Neill: Okay, my second and final question at this moment—you said the bill has been withdrawn. I did not realize that. This is not the bill that has anything to do with the two committees; it is the bill that has to do with the referendum, is it?

Mr Bredt: It is the same bill that deals with the referendum and with the committees and was being debated in the Legislature. I am not 100% clear on exactly what took place, but my sense of it was that there had been some thought that there would be all-party agreement on this bill. It became quite clear that the opposition was going to oppose the bill because it thought it did not fairly represent the recommendations of the Bélanger-Campeau report. It is unclear now whether the government intends to proceed with the bill. I guess that was my comment. It is unclear to me where they propose to go. Do you have anything to add to that, David?

1620

Ms Y. O'Neill: At this second it is kind of in second reading.

Mr Bredt: I am sorry, I do not know. My sense of it was that the government had decided to withdraw the bill. Whether they are going to choose to reintroduce it or not—

Ms Y. O'Neill: It would be really helpful if we could keep that up to date.

Mr Bredt: Why do we not deal with that as follows: I can find out exactly what the situation is and convey that to the Chair of the committee.

Ms Gigantes: I thought the bill had been withdrawn and there was not a decision yet about what to do about it.

The Chair: We will get the latest word on that and we will pass it on to members of the committee.

Ms Harrington: My question was exactly that: Please clarify the bill. Further to that, the two committees that came out of that, they are not directly related to the bill itself in any way, are they?

Mr Bredt: Yes, very much so. What the bill does is establish the two committees and also establish a process for the referendum either in July or October. So it is all part of the same bill.

Ms Harrington: So, in effect, the establishment of those committees is now up in the air.

Mr Bredt: Yes.

Ms Harrington: It is not final. Thank you.

Mr Offer: One short question dealing with all of the processes that are fluttering around the country: Is it your impression that Quebec will not partake in any type of discussion but will rather await offers on whatever the result of these committees is, whether they be through the committee or through premiers' meetings, but it will just wait to receive as opposed to take part in the formulation of offers?

Mr Bredt: My sense of it is that there are very much mixed signals that are coming from Quebec. There have been indications the committee may well meet with the federal committee when it does its tour across the country this fall. That has certainly not been stated clearly by either the Premier or by Mr Rémiillard. In terms of whether that committee would meet with other committees such as yourselves, again, that is unclear.

Mr Bourassa certainly is prepared to meet bilaterally with his counterparts and, as you are all aware, he met with the Premier last week. The best I can say is that it is still unclear as to whether or not and to what extent the Quebec committees will be meeting with other committees or would be participating in these types of processes.

Mr Offer: Just a very short supplementary on that line of questioning: It seems there are emerging two tracks of discussion, the first being in general the creation of the committees across this province, but, of a fairly recent nature, the premiers also meeting. I am wondering if you might share with us your thought as to whether those two tracks, if you see them as that, will ever merge or whether they are going to be kept separate and if that might result in some problem as to criticism of the process down the line.

Mr Bredt: In terms of what the federal government has announced, the process will be its parliamentary committee meeting bilaterally across the country with the various different committees. Mr Clark has also indicated he has had a round of meetings with the premiers across the country. There has been some indication that before the federal proposal is actually tabled publicly there may be another round of such meetings, but again, there have been no clear announcements about that from the federal government.

Mr Winner: My question is complementary to Steve's and you may have partially answered it. I was struck, when I read the Bélanger-Campeau report, by the fact that after all these research papers submitted and all this heated discussion they obviously had, there were no options laid out for federal renewal and that the onus seemed to be shifted to all of the other provinces and the federal government to come forward with offers. I wonder whether that was a political position or whether it just was not within their mandate.

Mr Bredt: I think that when you look at the two Quebec reports the Allaire report was primarily substance with very little on the process, whereas Bélanger-Campeau was primarily process but very little on the substance. Certainly it has been suggested that given the political differences between the people on the Bélanger-Campeau committee it was difficult to reach consensus on substantive issues, so they focused on the process issues which were more susceptible to agreement, whereas in the Allaire report, it

being a report of one political party, it was easier to reach more substantive proposals.

Mr Winninger: I have one supplementary. Given that there seems to be some resistance on behalf of the Bélanger-Campeau committee to meet with our own committee, I am just wondering what the accepted avenue for making these offers of renewed federalism might be.

Mr Bredt: First of all, I would say that the Bélanger-Campeau committee is now defunct so that it is no longer around to meet with anybody, not just the Ontario select committee. I think the real question will be the willingness of the committee that may be established to look at options for a federal Canada to meet with other committees.

In response to the second part of your question, which is, how does the process move forward if Quebec is not prepared to meet with committees such as yours, my sense of it, from Quebec's perspective, is that it will wait to receive offers.

Ms Gigantes: Send them an offer.

The Chair: Are there any other questions? I think we can proceed then with the presentation.

Dr Careless: My purpose in my remarks is to give you a brief box score of the history of constitutional reform. As Chris has pointed out, there are hits and misses in this exercise, which has preoccupied recent Canadian history from about 1962 on. I think it would be more helpful, rather than giving you a straight chronology, to perhaps ask how governments in Canada have addressed four basic and enduring themes in Confederation, because it would strike me that these are likely to be the ones that will remain with us as we move towards the next set of negotiations.

These themes I want to look at are, first, how do you express the common values that are held by the majority of Canadians as an effort to build nationhood? Second, how do you provide a formal balance between national and regional communities? Third, how do you preserve and promote our Confederation commitment to language integrity—between English and French—in the presence of an increasingly plural society in which other identities are equally important if not more important? Fourth, how do you improve the relationship between citizens and government? How do you progressively make this a more democratic form of government in Canada?

As I have made these four observations, what is immediately apparent is that there is no mention whatsoever of the aboriginal agenda. If I might suggest, this might be a self-contained item that should be looked at by someone who is specializing in that area. So I will leave that out of my remarks.

1630

The approach I want to use to address these four themes is really to summarize the extent of intergovernmental discussions and achievements by looking into four topic areas. One is the amending process, the second is the division of powers, the third is the issue of rights and the fourth is the issue of institutions. I am going to confine my examination, and I am sure my expertise, if there is any, to really looking at government initiatives. I am not going to comment on the interesting suggestions that have come

from, say, the Task Force on Canadian Unity—the Pépin-Robarts task force—from the Macdonald commission on Canadian economic union, or from Bill C-60, which was a federal proposal in 1978. A number of these proposals did not formally enter the process of negotiation and I am setting them to one side in my remarks.

Also, I am not covering the more prominent history of success in Canada on these four themes, which is the non-constitutional resolution of these four questions that I have posed. One could talk at great length about the success of shared-cost programs, of reciprocal agreements on language, which may have achieved many of these objectives without having to turn at all to constitutional success or failure.

Finally, I should say I am going to try to keep my editorial comments to a minimum and leave any reflections on the merits or success or failure to people who have academic qualifications in this area.

First of all, I would like to look at the amending process. In each case I would like to talk about what I think the issue is and then how we have approached this intergovernmentally in the constitutional forum.

On the amending formula, I am sure you are aware that Canada did not give itself, or ask from Britain when it left the British empire, its own unique amending formula. It is one of the unique dominions that, when it left in 1932, asked Great Britain if it would retain the amending process until we had struck one we could all agree to. As you know, we did not achieve that until 1982.

The questions on the amending process—I think there are three—are, first, how do you strike a procedure for identifying, negotiating, entrenching and changing the values that we hold in common and those that we hold in difference; second, how do you settle on a formula that is a blend of, on the one hand, flexibility—that is, we want to be able to keep the Constitution modern—and on the other hand, rigidity—that is, we want to protect vulnerable minorities from whimsical changes of majorities from time to time; and the third question is, how do you make all of this understandable and accessible to Canadians?

In terms of my four themes, it seems to me that if we get the amending process right, we are going to make a major contribution to this first theme. A good amending process and formula should be a major contribution to nation-building.

In the approach tried by governments from the period of 1962 to 1990, the first priority was, of course, getting a formula. It was part of Mr Trudeau's package, and even earlier than that, that if we could get an amending formula we could then patriate the Constitution and become fully and entirely a free-standing dominion within the British Commonwealth. The issue of whether this formula could then be exercised through a clear and democratic legislative process did not arise until after 1982.

When you are trying to strike a good formula, you are really asking yourself three questions: what items should be subject to unilateral action by either the federal government or the provincial government; what actions could be agreed to, based simply on a majority of some size among governments; and what topics have to be changed only when you have unanimity among governments.

The first and unsuccessful attempt in recent years on an amending formula was what is known as the Fulton-Favreau formula, named after two ministers of justice in the Liberal and Tory governments in the early 1960s. It is an interesting formula in that it is a complete reverse of the one we have today. Whereas today we protect our national institutions behind unanimity and we allow our division of powers to be changed based on 7 and 50, Fulton-Favreau would have allowed division of powers to be changed only if we could unanimously agree to that change but would have allowed national institutions to be changed based on 7 and 50.

As it turned out, the Fulton-Favreau formula did not succeed. It was reported by the commentators at the time that Quebec perhaps realized that it would have liked quite a bit more flexibility on changing the division of powers, because that was the agenda it had for the 1960s, and unanimity seemed to be quite a difficult obstacle for any change. Therefore, Quebec, if I have understood history correctly, was the party that said in retrospect that it did not think it could go along with the formula. We did not succeed then, in 1964, with our first attempt at an amending formula.

The second attempt was the Victoria formula. It was related to what we call the Victoria charter, which was an intergovernmental agreement on a range of constitutional reforms in 1971. It was a flip on the Fulton-Favreau formula. The importance of unanimity was reduced dramatically, in fact almost eliminated. Their approach was that they did not want to use 7 and 50. What they wanted to use was a formula in which the federal government, any province with 25% of the population, which would have been Ontario and Quebec at that time, any two of the Atlantic provinces and any two of the Western provinces having 50% of western population would have to agree. Here was a threshold that set up the idea, as was later complained about in the west, of second-class provinces. It looked as if Ontario and Quebec would always have a veto and that you would have to get some combination of provinces in the west or in the east to exercise a western or eastern veto.

But what was interesting here was that there was at least a notion of region, there was a notion of flexibility. It was a more flexible formula than Fulton-Favreau. They did add the concept, which now appears in our current Constitution, of bilateral amendments, the idea that maybe a province together with the federal government could amend something that did not apply to the rest of Canada. As with so many of these earlier stages of failed attempts, we find some of the seeds of ideas that then reappear in the final version in 1982.

The formula that we have in 1982, which is the law of the land, is often called the Vancouver formula. I have heard it called the Edmonton formula. It depends on where you thought it was conceived, I suppose. This is a return to this idea of a two-tier formula—unanimity for some things and a modest threshold, a majority threshold, for others. But as I said to you a moment ago, it is an inversion of Fulton-Favreau. Now the national institutions will be hidden behind or embedded in the unanimity provision and the

division of powers in the charter is covered by a 7 and 50 threshold.

The aspect of the formula that is appealing to the west, of course, is that no one province has a better chance at a veto than others. There is not the sense of a second-class status for some province that must join with another in order to have an impact. So the idea that the veto was a longer part of the vocabulary was attractive.

It was also important that equality of provinces was emphasized in this new formula. The formula also includes a provision for opting out of an amendment that may otherwise carry in Canada. If it derogates from your provincial powers and you choose not to have that occur you can, in certain circumstances, opt out. In some circumstances, we also see financial compensation if the effect of the new federal acquisition of the power would mean that it would be spending in that area where provinces once spent. In the areas of education and culture, you could receive compensation if you chose not to assent to an amendment that would otherwise be carrying in the rest of Canada.

This formula retains the provisions for bilateral change to our Constitution. You will have heard a number of your witnesses talking about the prospect of being able to use this perhaps as a way of fine-tuning or changing the Constitution, whether or not the rest of or a great number of the provinces might be able to go along. It also introduced the idea of a time limit, the matter that posed difficulty for the Meech Lake accord, that on certain kinds of amendments you require no more than three years to reach an agreement for them to carry.

1640

In the 1987 Meech Lake accord we would have made one final change to the amending process. We would have shifted more items into the unanimity category. The Supreme Court of Canada, the provision for new provinces and changes to the Senate and the House of Commons would have been clearly and solidly located behind a unanimity provision. We would also have broadened the categories in which we would have given financial compensation to provinces which chose not to be part of an amendment that, if carried in Canada and when carried in Canada, would have derogated from their powers.

I said that was the first half of the amending formula conundrum: How do you actually get yourself a formula that is both flexible and rigid? The second portion is, how do you get the public to participate in this exercise and also to understand it?

What is interesting is that up until 1982 any amendment, including the constitutional change of 1982, had simply to be agreed to by the Governor General in Council and by the Lieutenant Governor. Therefore, the assent and the instruction could largely come from the executive level of government. In 1982, however, the process for amending the Constitution became entirely legislative, so there is no reference to executive federalism and there is no formal role for the executive to play in the process of amending the Constitution. The resolution has to be submitted to the Legislature in question and has to be approved by a majority of the members in that Legislature. On the basis of that, the Governor General is informed of the action of a provincial

Legislature and he waits for the action also to be concluded at the federal level.

In 1990, had the Meech Lake accord passed, we were prepared to put the idea of drafting a Canada clause to our Constitution to an all-party House of Commons committee following the passage of the Meech Lake accord. That was as a result of the 1990 accord that was agreed to among first ministers about this time last year in Ottawa. We would have introduced another approach to adding other clauses to our Constitution.

There was also mentioned in that accord the adding of the idea that there be mandatory public hearings at any time there was a constitutional amendment going through a provincial Legislature. As Chris has mentioned also, we have another wrinkle, another addition to the amending process now with the British Columbia provision that a referendum would need to be held at the time that there was a constitutional amendment.

What we have done, therefore, in summary of this exercise of amending the Constitution, is we have moved from a concept of changing the ground rules of our Constitution, which were very strongly executive-dominated, very much a feature of the traditional concept of responsible government where we gave a lot of power to the cabinet and then held it responsible for that, to a form of representative amending formula in which we are now formally incorporating the Legislatures by law. The representatives, not simply the executives, are responsible for this function and, as you can see, mention of a referendum or mention of, say, a constituent assembly is moving this even further beyond the tradition in Parliament, from responsible to representative and now perhaps to a popular or populist form of direct democracy.

The second area I said I would look at as a topic, addressing the theme of how do we provide for a Confederation balance, is the question of division of powers. Here, I think there are two questions that historically we have looked at. First, should the common responsibilities that governments in Canada have, federal or provincial and municipal, be divided or shared or asymmetrical? Second, should the federal government continue to retain the provisions of 1867 that allow it to override provincial laws and policies, notwithstanding the division of powers? These are sometimes called override powers or exceptional emergency powers, and there is a range of them, from peace, order and good government to declaratory power—lots of technical terms—and spending power.

I think the division-of-powers exercise in both of these categories was trying to address this theme I mentioned at the beginning of how do you get the balance right between a national commitment in this society, a commitment to strong regions and a commitment to our linguistic founding communities?

With regard to the approach that we took, first, on the redistribution of powers, on the whole I think one should say that there has been almost no significant constitutional reform. Much of the change to the roles of federal and provincial governments have occurred outside the Constitution, in a de facto and an administrative sense. What formal redistribution there has been has largely been tilted

towards greater provincial involvement in either what once was exclusive federal responsibility or in areas that were not even foreseen in 1867 in the Constitution, matters such as the environment and communications.

I would balance that by saying there are other moves that are not directly related to the division of powers which do, I think, counterbalance the idea that the provinces were getting a significant increase in influence through a division-of-powers reform.

Let me give you some examples of what I think explains this provincial tilt. First of all, a couple of misses, if we are talking about hits and misses: In the Victoria exercise, between 1969 and 1971, the federal government's activity in family allowances, manpower, guaranteed income, old age security and youth allowances, which it had been in over the preceding 10 years, would have been confirmed as concurrent, but there was a real struggle as to whether the provinces would reassert their paramouncy in this area. So there was quite a tension between which order of government should be paramount in these new social service areas.

The tension was made a little more clear in 1974 when there was a series of letters between Prime Minister Trudeau and individual premiers, although they never got together in a negotiating context we are more familiar with, say, in 1981. Here, the provinces were clearly out to enlarge their powers. Unambiguously, they wanted to move into communications, particularly cable, they wanted to have the same rights over offshore natural resources as they enjoyed on land, they wanted control over fisheries, control over or greater access to the taxation of natural resources and an extended role in culture, particularly broadcasting.

The real achievement, because these were only negotiating positions, came for the provinces in 1982, when there was an addition to our 1967 Constitution—we call it section 92A—which confirmed the provincial control over the extraction and exploration of natural resources, enlarged their right of direct taxation over non-renewable natural resources and energy and relaxed the constraints that had to that date been on provinces on the interprovincial trade in energy and non-renewable natural resources. For most observers then, this was, in the division-of-powers exercise, a clear tilt of the Constitution towards the provinces. Had the Meech Lake accord passed in 1990, many observers felt that the immigration agreement that was provided for there might also have been a further tilt towards provincial autonomy or pre-eminence.

When you ask what in the division-of-powers exercise over the last 25 years has been in the federal government's favour, again, there are a number of misses before we talk about hits. I suppose one might say the bad news was that in the Victoria process, because it failed, the federal government did not have affirmed its concurrent rights in these social policy areas that I have named.

In 1982, Mr Trudeau suggested that, for all the focus on powers that the provinces wanted to improve, he wanted to address the economic union and was particularly arguing for an enhanced federal power to police an economic union. But again, there was no success on that one, and it did not form part of the agreement in the eventual constitutional amendment.

1650

So when you ask yourself where there have been federal successes, I think one does look to division-of-powers exercises that are not yet entrenched in the Constitution. The federal government has, through its use of the spending power, brought national standards into the provision of health care. The federal government has intervened increasingly into regional equalization and, with section 36 of our Constitution, may now have achieved an enhanced responsibility in that area. Also, as most observers note, the charter was certainly the most unifying feature of Canada that came out of the 1982 Constitution, although I am not certain many observers would agree that the charter has much impact on the division of powers *per se*.

I said there was another dimension to the division of powers that had to be resolved. It is not strictly the matter of who has section 91 powers and section 92 powers, but what we should do about those early provisions in our Confederation that allowed the federal government to intrude on the provincial government responsibilities, which was probably consistent with the conception of Confederation; that is, that these provincial governments were merely municipal governments and some were quite immature and some not even formed yet at the time of Confederation. It was not surprising, I guess, in the idea of putting together a new nation, that the federal government might need some of those additional capacities to move in where provinces could not do the job or might be doing the job in a way that was not responsive to the interests of other provinces or Canada.

There is a mixed story on the capacity of the federal government to take over and to interfere in the provincial area. The courts have managed to keep alive all of these provisions, whether they be spending power, declaratory power, reservation and disallowance, or peace, order and good government. These powers have not at any point been defined by the court as dead or of no continuing value.

The federal government has also actively used the spending power, the capacity to make grants in any jurisdiction on any head—which is the privilege of the monarch to give gifts to her subjects, I suppose—quite extensively. For many provinces, led by Quebec and other provinces like Saskatchewan in the past, this has proved to be a continuing source of intervention, of duplication and of a collapsing of the notion that there should be two separate heads of responsibility, one federal and one provincial.

But here the federal government too has provided, I think, an interesting legacy on how the spending power might be handled. In 1969—this is a miss, admittedly, on constitutional reform—the federal government promised it would in future subject its use of the spending power to approval of the provinces, not much different from 7 and 50. In other words, they said they would use the spending power in a provincial jurisdiction provided that seven provinces representing 50% of Canada's population would agree.

In the Victoria exercise in 1971, the federal government agreed to eliminate or proposed that it would eliminate the reservation and disallowance power, that provision in which it can, through the Governor General, reach into the provincial Legislature and hoist a piece of legislation out

of that Legislature for the review of the Governor General, and if necessary the Governor General could disallow it.

In 1979 the federal government again offered to make the spending power subject to a provincial consensus, lowering it this time to 6 and 50. And in the Meech Lake accord, as I am sure most of you know, the federal government would have been prepared to provide reasonable compensation to a province that chose not to be in a national shared-cost program in an exclusive provincial area, if the province was prepared to provide a program comparable with these national objectives.

The story, therefore, on the capacity of the federal government to override the provincial governments in their jurisdiction is one that has been subject to a great deal of intergovernmental negotiation and at times self-restraint and at other times perhaps, in the Canada Health Act, a federal insistence that there be national standards. But there has been no formal resolution of this particular aspect of the division of power in the Constitution.

The third area I suggested we might look at is the issue of rights: How have the protection of and the definition of rights contributed to these themes that I mentioned at the beginning of my presentation? When you talk rights, the issue of rights is really a catch-all term. In my mind, it addresses three possible areas. One is the right of the individual or group to be protected from government intervention, another one is the right of depressed regions to be entitled to government equalization, and the third one is what we might call, loosely speaking, the community rights of Quebec to be recognized as a distinct society.

Now again, rights, if we address them in constitutional reform, should address that fundamental theme of Confederation: How do we get the balance between our linguistic commitments of 1867 in synch with our increasing pluralism of the late 20th century, and also how do we address that relationship between the citizen and the government, the enhanced democracy that we wish to see in a modern nation?

On these three, then, the approach: First, on the protection of individual and collective rights, I can only very broadly sketch what has been done over the years. I should mention, of course, that this protection is not a feature of any constitutional activity alone, that there have been antecedents in provincial human rights codes and in the Diefenbaker charter in which, in a statutory form, we were identifying and protecting these rights. We continue to do that, of course, in our own human rights codes.

But in the Victoria exercise of 1969 to 1971—a miss—none the less, the federal government and the provinces would have agreed to the protection of fundamental freedoms such as the freedom of conscience, opinion, religion and expression. Interestingly, even then they were going to make those freedoms subject to a reasonableness test; that is, that the right would be guaranteed subject only to such reasonable limits that were prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society, a phrase that, as you know, is in section 1 of our current Charter of Rights and Freedoms. They would have defined and protected political rights and they would have reaffirmed the linguistic rights that we have in our original Constitution; that is, the right to speak and to have the

legislative proceedings in English and French in almost every Legislature across Canada.

No success from that process. In 1974, Prime Minister Trudeau tried to make an offer to the provinces to patriate the Constitution with a very simple language right guarantee that would apply only at the federal level. The provinces, while not unsympathetic to that, were at this stage saying they wanted no treatment of the Constitution without also putting in the package a redivision of powers.

In 1982, of course, we achieved the full Charter protection not only of some of these rights but even more. Fundamental freedoms—the ones I mentioned—are now protected: political freedoms are in, legal freedoms and rights, equality rights, mobility rights, language rights and statements related to the aboriginal people and multiculturalism. The two additional elements in this Constitution are the provision of section 33, where a government, whether it be provincial or federal, can under certain circumstances through the Legislature allow its legislation to stand, even though it violates a provision in the Charter in so far as fundamental, legal or equality rights are violated. But as I am sure you know, section 23 on the language rights cannot be overridden by this provision.

1700

The other provision is the section 1 provision, the reasonableness test, in which it is stated again, as it was in the Victoria process, that a government might be able to restrict these rights, notwithstanding the provision in the constitution, provided that these restrictions were within reasonable limits prescribed by law as demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

The 1987 exercise: Had Meech Lake passed, it would have been a confirmation that the multicultural and aboriginal elements of the Charter would not have been affected by the "distinct society" provisions of the Meech Lake accord.

The second of the three rights areas I suggested should be addressed is the regional equalization, the right of a depressed region, a chronically poor region, to be entitled to some form of support on the revenue side of its budget. This actually goes back very far as a tradition in Canada. It goes back into the period of the late 1940s, and was, in a sense, just formally entrenched in the constitution of 1982. In the constitution there is a right, if you could put it that way, that a provincial government should have sufficient revenues, and some of those may therefore have to come through transfer payments from, say, the federal government, so that it can deliver reasonably comparable levels of service at a comparable burden of taxation.

The third area of rights I suggested we might look at in terms of the record is the treatment of distinct society. The question here, as put in the Meech Lake accord, was whether we could identify Quebec as a "distinct society" and recognize its capacity to preserve and promote this distinct identity, while at the same time not diminishing any of the existing powers, rights or privileges of the Parliament, government of Canada, or Legislatures of the provincial House.

This, I suppose, is not so much a right—because it has often been contested by rights groups as somewhat less important than individual and collective rights—as what is

sometimes called a community interest. It is, as a collective community interest, to be balanced against the individual and the collective rights in the Charter. The issue at stake here, and there are varied opinions as to whether the balance was correct, is whether there should be a balance and whether the balance is right. This is an issue that has been quite an old tradition in Canada, and in no way did it simply appear in the Meech Lake accord.

For example, we have in our constitution the Canada pension plan and Quebec pension plan, which finds a balance between a national and a Quebec-based scheme. There are different family allowance regimes with the federal family allowance cheque in Quebec, or have been in the past. Some provinces have exercised the right to opt out of shared-cost programs. Section 93, the education provision, and section 133, the official language provision, apply differently in provinces, through the Constitution. Senate representation is different through our Constitution, and there is a provision in what we call section 94 for the uniformity of laws, that does not apply equally, even today across Canada, so the concept of there being a slightly different balance between the obligations of the Constitution and the rights of a community interest is fairly well established.

It also appears that the courts have recognized for quite some time that there could be a difference of emphasis between the individual right and the community interest in provinces. Particularly we think of the *Chasseur Brown* case in Quebec, in which the court affirmed that it could understand the prospect of there being a difference of guarantee. What they were concerned about was that the extent of protection of the French language was out of proportion to the threat or the challenge to that language.

In the "distinct society" debate, then, in 1980, there was a proposal that "distinct society" be put into our preamble. That was not a successful exercise. We did not end up with a significant preamble in our Constitution.

In 1982, it might be argued that section 33 and section 1, which we find in the charter, in some way a reflection of an interest or an understanding of a distinct society.

In 1987, there would have been an explicit preservation and recognition of a distinct society, but again, as I quoted to you from the Meech Lake accord, this would have been a distinct society that, once recognized, could be preserved and promoted only under a number of specific conditions.

In 1990, at this time last year, the first ministers got together to take a final look at the Meech Lake accord. As you may know, they asked a number of distinguished lawyers to give their opinion on whether the "distinct society" clause would have jeopardized provisions that were currently existing under the charter and under the Constitution. If I might read, their opinion was that:

"In our opinion, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms will be interpreted in a manner consistent with the duality 'distinct society' clause of the proposed constitutional amendment, 1987, the Meech Lake accord. But the rights and freedom guaranteed thereunder are not infringed or denied by the application of the clause and continue to be guaranteed, subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by laws that can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society, and the duality 'distinct society'

clause may be considered, in particular, in the application of section 1 of the charter."

Finally, I said that the fourth topic area would be the area of institutions and what we have been doing over the years to sustain the institutions and reform them. The issue is, what form of national institutions will assure effective representation of regional and bicultural interests in the making and adjudication of national policy? We can look at Parliament, federalism and the Supreme Court of Canada.

The constitutional record in terms of reform on the matter of parliamentary reform is in fact very short. The issue of Senate reform was not talked about in a formal sense among governments until 1990. It did not enter into any of the constitutional documents we have used on the table between governments. There has been no further discussion about the reform of, say, proportional representation in the House of Commons or any other changes to Parliament, so the record of addressing institution reform is quite limited.

When we look at the second area of national institutions, federalism itself, the record here has been that there has been a provision in the Constitution to hold first ministers' conferences on the aboriginal agenda. There was a proposal in 1987 to also add first ministers' conferences on the economy and on constitutional reform, but there has been no achievement on this in any formal sense in our constitutional documents at present.

Finally, the other national institution would be the Supreme Court of Canada. Have we achieved any goals in that area? The Supreme Court has existed in federal legislation since 1867, but it has not been formally and properly and completely entrenched in our Constitution, and to this day has not been entirely entrenched, according to a number of constitutional scholars. There have been a number of attempts to do this. The latest would have been in the Meech Lake accord. They would have entrenched the Supreme Court, put its change to a question of unanimity, specified its composition and required the provinces to nominate candidates, but that did not come to pass.

I will conclude my remarks at that point. The thrust of what I would say is that on the citizen-government relationship, we have achieved a charter and a limited amount of experience on the legislative role in constitutional change. On the national-regional balance, we have not really, formally in the Constitution explored the issue of asymmetry or the prospect of national standards apart from the federal government. On nation-building, we have not changed the division of powers in that direction, if anything; also we have not changed any institutions to enhance that. On the issue of pluralism, this new element in Canadian federalism, we have some brief mentions of the aboriginal, the multicultural and the equality dimension of our country in the charter.

1710

The Chair: Thank you very much. There are a couple of questions. Mrs O'Neill?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I wish I had some of your expertise, Dr Careless. It is outstanding how you can bring us through all of that and do not seem to get caught.

I would like to ask two simple questions. They are simple because, as I say, I find it all very complex. You talked about mobility rights one place there. Could you say a little bit more about that?

Dr Careless: There is a section in our 1982 Constitution which allows a citizen to move across the country and to pursue a livelihood in any province and not to be discriminated against on the basis of a residence requirement, but it is limited to that dimension.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: It has nothing to do with licensing or educational qualifications?

Dr Careless: No. My understanding was that the courts have not translated that into an obligation that, you know, a doctor's licence or—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am thinking teaching; I am thinking some of the trades.

Dr Careless: Yes, or a real estate licence or a licence to practise law. You might know more of that, Chris.

Mr Bredt: I think the leading cases that have dealt with section 6 of the charter have been cases that have involved the professions. There is a case called *Black v. The Law Society of Upper Canada* which dealt with an attempt by the Alberta government to keep the Toronto law firm of McCarthy and McCarthy from opening up in Alberta, and that provision of the Law Society of Alberta was ultimately struck down because of that. There was also a case that dealt with doctors moving to practise in British Columbia. They had a system there that essentially made it very difficult for non-British Columbia doctors to get billing numbers to bill their equivalent of the OHIP, and again, that type of provision was struck down.

There has not been a great deal of litigation and certainly no process that would compel the provinces to move together in terms of standard-setting. I think the general principles have been that each province is entitled to set its own standards, and as long as non-residents of the provinces are entitled to take the same exams or meet those standards, those have not been seen as violating section 6, at least in the case law to date.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: My second question has a very personal note for me. I am sure I have some grave misunderstandings, and I am trying to keep abreast of the issue, but the speech from the throne federally talked about what have been considered educational matters and some of these are being interpreted as strictly provincial matters. I wonder if you could comment about that. Is it skills training or is it a desire to be involved in something that to this point has been considered quite provincial?

Dr Careless: The issue of education has not been on the agenda of formal constitutional reform. The activity that has been carried out in terms of the federal and provincial governments working together largely has been through the form of co-operative federalism, the informal administrative agreements, and in that case there has been, from my recollection, a fair degree of success on the skills training side, a fair degree of working together. On the education side I think it is a little more sharply drawn, and the question I think is still open as to what role the federal

government will be playing in conjunction with the education ministries in Canada, although of course the federal government has its own programs directed towards various research centres and towards students in particular.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Would any of you be able to say how that it is sitting in Quebec, this speech from the throne that we are all kind of wondering what it means?

Mr Bredt: You are not the only one who is wondering what it means. I think the reaction in Quebec to the federal government announcement about pursuing initiatives as part of its competitiveness agenda in the education field, to put it mildly, has not been a positive one. They are very concerned about that announcement and where the federal government intends to go. I think that is as much as I can help you on that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: My final caveat then is, are there any other responses from any other provinces on this issue that you know of?

Mr Bredt: I think there are ongoing discussions among the various governments about the federal government initiative. My sense of it is that there is nothing formal. Certainly there have been statements by not just Quebec; I think there were statements by the governments of British Columbia and Alberta about their concerns as well. In part, some of their concerns reflect the fact that the federal government's announcement was unclear. It was kind of a general indication of interest in the area, but no clear indication as to what that meant in practical terms.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for being as helpful as possible.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. You have given some historical perspective to all of this. I am wondering if I could ask two questions based on what history has taught us and then moving from this day forward. It is on the issue of a constituent assembly, first, and second, whether provinces such as this province and others, keeping in mind the lessons of the past, would be likely to accept a drastic change in the division of powers. I am wondering if I might obtain from you your sense as to that, and on the issue of constituent assembly, with respect to the perspective of Quebec, whether from the lessons of the past it might in any way, shape or form ever entertain the notion of constituent assembly.

Dr Careless: On the constituent assembly one, I am going to confine my response on Quebec strictly to what we know from the past situation. In no way would this be a comment on where the present government is.

Most observers who look at the situation in Quebec note how strongly supportive voters are of the traditional parliamentary process and practice in that province. The government tends to have a very high popularity rating and the role of government and particularly the role of cabinet seem to be fairly well accepted. The kind of debate that may have been entertained here in Ontario, and we find in the media generally, is one that seems to be more common within the English-speaking parts of Canada, in which there is a sense that maybe one can supplement or complement or even replace the role of the executive. I am simply making an observation that most commentators have

noted, that the Quebec people seem to be quite a bit more traditional and perhaps more trusting in the role of the cabinet to speak for the government and the people of Quebec.

On the issue of whether provinces would be disposed to drastic change, again, looking back at history, I think there is no question that one would have to say that Quebec has always been the driving force and that from time to time other provinces have been drawn into that vortex and have found it advantageous to have Quebec sustaining the argument repeatedly that social policy and economic policy have to go back to where they were originally designed in 1867. From time to time the government of Alberta and even the government of Saskatchewan have joined in the idea of much stronger provincial powers. Indeed Ontario, many, many years ago in the 1920s, probably coined some of the strongest notions of separatism and self-determination.

But I think there is no even record on this and no consistent record. For some provinces the amount of decentralization depends on where they are in the business cycle and whether they feel confident about going it alone in a number of areas, knowing that perhaps there would not be federal funding if they took over the portfolio entirely. For some provinces, the prospect of retaining a national market free of barriers policed by federal standards perhaps is very attractive. You can imagine the eastern provinces strongly support that.

Again, strictly looking back at the history, one would want to say Quebec is certainly well out front on this issue and then in behind from time to time you get a number of provinces that are supportive of greater decentralization. Consistently though, one would want to say the eastern provinces have been the least willing to contemplate something that would diminish the federal presence in a lot of their portfolios.

1720

Mr Offer: I just have a short follow-up question. Much of the discussion, though not all, I recognize, has always centred around this whole division of powers. In your presentation you alluded to the amending process, the 7-50 rule, for any change in the division of powers. Is it your opinion that potentially some of the questions, the issues, the change in the division of powers, whatever they may be, when finally agreed to might be entertained with the current amending formula?

Dr Careless: The last bit was?

Mr Offer: Might be able to be entertained and addressed with the amending formula as it presently exists.

Dr Careless: This is in the realm of speculation. The words "amending formula" are, of course, thankfully a very large term within the present Constitution, so one can contemplate a number of bilateral changes that might possibly be made. When we came before you the last time, Chris addressed the prospect of that happening.

The 7-50, I think a number of observers would feel, is still a reasonable prospect in a number of functional areas. Again, you would have to decide if you would be happy leaving Quebec out of an amendment. But I think the commentators who are now looking at the amending formula are more concerned about the unanimity dimension of that

rather than whether the 7-50 has ceased to be of any relevance. As I say, there are other elements. The right to opt out is, I think, particularly interesting and the bilateralism, the one or two provinces getting together, might offer a good prospect.

Mr Winninger: On that issue of the amending formula, I was reading a paper Roland Penner gave in April in Winnipeg dealing with that and where do we go from Meech. His suggestion seemed to be that since unanimity is almost impossible to achieve among the first ministers they should, before they sit down at the first ministers' conferences, build an informal consensus but, with respect to all possible matters that can be resolved through the 7-50 rule, concentrate on those areas for change. Otherwise, change might be beyond our grasp. I wonder if you have any comment on that approach.

Dr Careless: I think the prospect of first ministers getting together, of course, stumbles against the problem Chris mentioned, the idea of executive federalism. Whether first ministers would include Quebec is going to be problematic as a general exercise, I think, this time around.

When it comes to first ministers getting together to agree to things in advance, probably that kind of work will have to be done in any event, but it will in the long run be the legislatures that will have to be confident that the resolution they are entertaining, either unilaterally or in conjunction with someone else, is going to get support in the same wording right across Canada. That may be as much a challenge to the legislatures to think about where the other legislatures are coming from at this present time.

Mr Malkowski: Would you mind answering two things I was thinking about? The first is, how could we then develop a relationship between Quebec and some of the other provinces? Where are the feds in it if they get defensive? Are language and culture and those divisions under federal leadership, or where will the provinces play in that? There seems to be this tension when it comes to language and culture, if you would not mind addressing that.

The second issue is the aboriginal land claims currently outstanding in Quebec. Do you have a sense at all of the role the aboriginals will have, that they want to see Canada remain together because then they are stronger? What would happen if Quebec were to become sovereign to those land claims?

Dr Careless: The first question, if I understand it, was to what extent the federal government can be an intermediary to Quebec in the matter of language and culture. Do I have that right, sir?

Mr Malkowski: No. It was how Quebec is defensive. They are not co-operating with other provinces; they prefer to talk directly to the federal government. Why would this happen? If Quebec were to become, let's say, more motivated or more independent, how would that influence the federal government in terms of leadership when it comes to the other provinces on these issues? What would happen on that?

Mr Bredt: That is a very difficult question to respond to. Let me give my best shot at it. I think currently the formal position of the Quebec government is that it will

only talk with the federal government on constitutional matters and will wait until they get a formal, binding offer from the federal government. Informally, Premier Bourassa has been meeting with other premiers including Premier Rae, and certainly raising with Premier Rae his concerns not only about the process but also about the substance. He has also raised it with the other premiers he has been meeting with.

It is very difficult to know how the Quebec process will roll out over the next month or so. Most commentators have suggested, and certainly the Premier has suggested, that the federal government cannot speak for all the provinces and the provinces are going to have to have a role in any upcoming constitutional negotiations.

Turning to the second question, which was the issue of the aboriginal groups in Quebec—

Mr Malkowski: How would Quebec react then? If there is an agreement for sovereignty, what would happen with the land claims then? Would that help or would that force Quebec to reconsider in terms of keeping Canada together if it comes to land claims?

Mr Bredt: With respect to the land claims, it is quite a complex situation in Quebec. Existing claims have been settled; for example, there is a James Bay agreement that was entered into with the Cree that has quite extensive provisions. There are other land claims outstanding that remain unsettled.

Within the aboriginal community in Quebec, some of the aboriginal groups are French-speaking and are more sympathetic to some of the nationalistic aims. Other aboriginal groups are English-speaking and are perhaps less sympathetic. The overriding goal of all the aboriginal groups in Quebec, like aboriginal groups in the rest of Canada, is to achieve a meaningful form of self-government, and how that would be realized in the context of Quebec sovereignty or in a renewed federalism is one of the issues this committee is going to have to grapple with.

The Chair: Mr Bisson. I think I would like to carry on with the presentation if we can.

1730

Mr Bisson: I basically have a very difficult question but I am looking for a short answer. You gave a fairly good historical perspective in regard to the whole question of the division of powers. It has always struck me somewhat that when you listen to different regions of the country speak, sometimes they are speaking the same message when it comes to that whole question. I am making a very bland statement, but basically that is the summation.

The other point is that probably those who stand the most to gain from trying to get more powers from the federal government tend to be the ones who do not want to do it. It seems to be an adverse position.

I have been following out west what has been happening, what the provincial governments out there or the people are feeling in regard to that question as well as Quebec. Where exactly are the maritime provinces on that question? Where are they coming from at this point?

Mr Bredt: The general position of the maritime provinces is that they are very much concerned about a

weakening of the federal government. That was clearly the view expressed by Premier Wells during the Meech Lake process and if you examine the statements of the other premiers, Ghiz in Prince-Edward Island, Cameron in Nova Scotia and McKenna in New Brunswick, they are very much concerned about turning the federal government into a post office.

Mr Bisson: We have lost that one.

Mr Bredt: In terms of all the provinces, the maritime provinces are very dependent upon the equalization payments they receive from the federal government and they are concerned that if the federal government is weakened, their ability to benefit from equalization might be weakened accordingly.

Mr Bisson: Can you surmise the western position?

Mr Bredt: The western position could change quite rapidly depending upon electoral outcomes in several of the provinces there. There are two landmarks I could give to you. Last year, a co-ordinated position was developed at Lloydminster among the premiers essentially calling for a devolution of certain economic powers to the provinces along with what you call equalized-tax points from the federal government; a turning over powers plus money to finance the powers.

At the most recent western premiers' conference, there was very much a shifting. Premier Filmon from Manitoba was less keen on this idea, as was Premier Devine. Again you see the split between the provinces that are benefiting from equalization and those provinces that are contributing. I think that gives you a quick thumbnail sketch of the west.

Dr Careless: I would just add one one qualification or observation. Sometimes it is a little too simple to talk about the choices centralizing or decentralizing. As Premier Rae said, even he could understand and entertain decentralization if one could sustain a number of national standards. Therefore, when you think of the Maritimes or the west, there may be other ways or a variety of ways by which they can get more control over the programs they own or that they think they should own more thoroughly, at the same time sustaining some degree of national entitlement.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have there been any changes in any initiatives or attitudes since Cameron has come on the scene in Nova Scotia? Wells seems to be not quite as outside the circle now. That is an observation I have from a distance.

Mr Bredt: Maybe I will ask Debbie Gillis to respond to that. She is our eastern representative and knows the east in a fair bit of detail.

Ms Gillis: I think there have been some change since Premier Cameron took over the leadership in Nova Scotia. You are right to say that Wells is not quite as outside the loop as he was when Premier Buchanan was the leader, in part because Cameron has made a very conscious effort to try and bring Wells in. He is very interested in developing a regional approach to both constitutional and economic issues and because of that has tried to include Premier Wells in a common-cause situational position. Premier Wells is not co-operating with that; he is still more intent

on developing his own position, which is different than some of the other three leaders.

Dr Cameron: It is a great pleasure to be before the committee again. I am tempted to say I am being offered up as comic relief, although I think that is unconscious because I may not be that funny. But let me say it is a change of pace, because we will be looking a little more at the future than at the past. If I were giving a title to the talk today, it would be Realistic Options for Constitutional Reform.

I will talk first about options in general and second about realistic options. I hope you will forgive me. As I thought about the presentation, I thought I should say at the outset that it will be a trifle discursive, not to mention perhaps even meandering. The image that came to mind as I thought about the presentation was rather that of the trail that cattle make when they are coming from the back 40 to the barn at the end of the day. There is, I think, if you followed those trails at any point in your life, a kind of bovine logic that is evident in the way they proceed. There will be, at least I hope, that degree of logic in what I am saying today. I should, though, assure you that I am going to proceed at a snappier pace than that of that cow.

Let me start with some comments about the options in general. There has been in the months following the failure of Meech Lake a lot of discussion about options, and the thinking, at least in the earlier stage of the process—I think this is fading to some extent now and it is time it should—has focused on certain categories that everybody used for organizing their thinking. C. D. Howe, to use one example, in a colloquium last fall organized the options that they wanted to explore into two heads. One was federalist options and the other was what they call “breaking the federalist mould,” which was a nicer way of talking about the country breaking up.

Under the federalist options, they described the status quo centralization, rebalancing Confederation, decentralization and asymmetrical federalism, which is a rather heavy-duty, 50-cent word for a fairly straightforward idea. We used to talk many years ago about special status for Quebec, and that became a no-no. We then invented “distinct society” and that now is a no-no, so we talk about asymmetrical federalism. The words get longer and more complicated, but the meaning is essentially the same.

Under the heading of breaking the federalist mould, they identified sovereignty-association, the Parti québécois proposal, a Canada of regions, the idea that there might be five sovereign regions—and outright independence for Quebec. That is a fairly straightforward kind of approach to organizing some of these. I think those are theoretically possible. I think it is true to say that you can imagine them actually happening. In other words, you could imagine an overall general decentralization of power from the federal government to the provincial governments, or centralization in the reverse direction.

You can imagine a substantially different treatment for Quebec as the focus of constitutional change, where one would address the particular concerns of Quebec and try to maintain the other relationships fairly stable. You can imagine full-scale independence, and of course you can imagine—in fact, this is the one I find easiest to imagine—

the status quo. In the months following Meech Lake, people, especially in Quebec, were fond of saying the status quo is dead, which always amused me, because as far as I know, the status quo is the only thing that is alive and everything else is dead or yet to be born.

I was interested too in a comment that a Québécois was making at a recent conference where it showed the shift of opinion as people began to recognize the complexity of making substantial changes. Where eight months ago, as I say, many people were talking about the status quo being dead, in regard to the Québécois who was making the presentation a couple of weeks ago, talked about—one of the headings of his discourse was “The Weight of the Status Quo.” There was a kind of grudging recognition that it is heavy, it is there and it is not that easy to change it.

What I want to do is complicate the issue a little bit, having laid out those general options, because I think there is an important sense in which—when you start examining it closely, and Tone was touching on this—those are not really likely to be options in the sense of the practically implementable outcomes of the debate we are facing, but several of those will likely be elements of options. In other words, they can be mixed and matched in different kinds of ways. When you talk about rebalancing Confederation or modernizing federalism, that is usually what you are getting into. That is the kind of grey face of reality where it is rather untidy, a bit of this, a touch of that, a dash of something else. That is the way, when you start getting down to cases, we have done our constitutional work.

For example, one could imagine some decentralization of social policy and perhaps of culture and some stronger national expression of the economic union, some special recognition of Quebec's distinctive character and perhaps a degree of institutional reform: reform of the Senate thrown in and much of the rest left the way it is. That is an alternative that presents itself to the mind at this stage and it really draws on a variety of these more simple options that have been described.

1740

So much for options. Now to say a bit about realistic options. What I would really like to do is look at some of the characteristics of what are likely to be realistic options. My principal focus is the relationship between Quebec and the rest of the country, but I think what I am going to say applies in greater or lesser degree to the various issues we are wrestling with, whether it is western alienation or discontent in the Atlantic region or whatever.

When it comes to realistic options, “realistic” is an important word to consider here. It means many things, but I would mention two. The first one might mean realistic in the sense that the alternatives being presented are deemed to be practicable or pragmatic, that they can be put into effect. The second way in which one can speak of realistic is in the sense that they are to the point, that the shoe pinches, so what you are going to do is provide a new, better-fitting shoe. You are not going to provide an arm-sling. So it is not beside the point; it is on the money. It addresses the problem that really has to be tackled.

Just a comment on “realistic” in the first sense, practical or pragmatic. When people talk about pragmatic reforms

and pragmatic proposals, what they typically mean I think is minimal change, modest change, small amounts of adjustment where you make changes and then you see how it goes and you make further changes. It is obviously a very sound way of proceeding in many circumstances, but I do think it is important to remember that in our present circumstances we have to consider practical and pragmatic in the context of our judgement about the reality we are confronting. It seems to me if you are facing, as a country, a genuine and fundamental crisis, then pragmatic may not mean minimal change, it may mean fairly significant or dramatic change, and I think one needs to ponder that question quite carefully.

I think it is one of the most difficult judgements that people in politics are confronted with from time to time, and it is my observation that the landscape is littered with empires and states and corporations whose leadership have got that question wrong and made the wrong adjustment, believed that a little change is all that is required, and then they are wiped off the map. Alternatively, they believe that dramatic change is required, when in fact perhaps it was not necessary and very much goes away.

I would like to talk more about realistic in the second sense, that is to say, to the point, effective in addressing the real problem and in assessing the realism of an option. From this point of view, it seems to me that you have to make a judgement about the nature of the issue you are tackling. If you understand the nature of the problem and your option is conceived effectively to address it, it is realistic. In looking at realistic options, I would say this depends heavily on what the real problem is. So the question then becomes, what is the real problem? What are we facing in this country at this stage?

To clarify the large point I want to make, I would just say by way of illumination advance a heretical proposition—just for discussion you understand. I am not necessarily serious about this, but to clarify the point, I think it is possible to make a very good, convincing case, at least in a debating situation, that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with our constitutional arrangements. You see why I say heretical. There are problems with the way the Constitution works here and there, but there is no substantial element of the Constitution that is so out of whack with the realities of Canadian life and day-to-day practice that it absolutely cries out for change. This is the heretical proposition I am advancing.

You could, if you look at it from that perspective, say that what we have in fact is a Constitution that has been flexible and highly adaptable to changing circumstances, perhaps best exemplified by its capacity to accommodate aggressive nationalism in Quebec and a very rapid development of Quebec's society and Quebec's economy. That has all been done within the framework of the existing Constitution and really without benefit of constitutional change, because I think there is a lot in the fact that when you look at the constitutional changes that have been made, for the most part, they in fact are not responding to the traditional concerns certainly of the government of Quebec and the National Assembly of Quebec. Yet there

has been this really very impressive evolution of Quebec society and its economy.

The immigration agreement was signed with the federal government after the Meech Lake accord collapsed, which is again providing an adjustment in terms of the present and future needs with respect to multiculturalism and immigration in Quebec. There have been opting-out arrangements that have been manufactured and implemented as seemed necessary in the circumstances, again without constitutional change. If you ask what the real problems relating to aboriginal peoples are, there are some very painful and difficult issues that aboriginal peoples are wrestling with relating to their social and economic life and levels of unemployment and land claims and so on, and some of these do not require constitutional attention to be tackled.

Even in the case of western Canada, the concern about alienation has not declined. If anything, it has decreased since 1984, when one has had very powerful western representation in the House of Commons. It started to grow rapidly during the Trudeau period, when there were fewer and fewer representatives from western Canada in the government. It was a massive change from that point of view in 1984, yet alienation still prevails. So if you say, "Well now, how is Senate reform going to transform this situation?" it is possible at least to imagine that the issues go deeper into our cultural and social soil than will be reached by even a change to the Senate.

One could further argue that Canada is in fact plagued with significant problems but that they are not in fact mostly constitutional in character. This is, as I say, in the present context I think, virtually a sacrilegious proposition to make, and since I venerate religion, I will not make it.

But what I wanted to get at is to set the stage to raise a question that, if you assume that is true or that there is some truth in that, you still have to accept the fact that we are in a hell of a mess. People are talking Constitution all the time and there is some kind of problem out there that to talk about means people talk about the Constitution. That is the vocabulary that is chosen to try to sort out the difficulties we are having.

How can that be? I think it is possible to have circumstances in which there is nothing particularly amiss in the workaday arrangements of a situation and yet the relationship has gone sour. I think this is a substantial part of what we are confronting as a country, and in the case of Quebec vis-à-vis the rest of the country, I think some of the dimensions of this are that there is a different conception of the association itself that composes Canada and a different emphasis on what is important as between Quebec and other parts of the country. There are radically different historical interpretations of what happened in the past and what it means and its bearing on what happened today.

There are clear feelings of rejection and alienation that are part of this picture and a more generalized phenomenon that we are wrestling with, perhaps partly because the internationalization of life is that, really, all across the country I think there are declining levels of loyalty to national symbols and national institutions. So what this raises

to my mind is the mythological dimension and the symbolic dimension to what we are talking about.

1750

Stefan Dupré, in a recent paper, has talked about the myth of imposition and the myth of rejection. With respect to the myth of imposition, he is talking about the arrangements of 1982 where the notion is that Quebec had imposed on it a constitutional regime that it did not accept. Clearly, in a technical sense, the National Assembly resisted that, and was against the 1982 arrangement. On the other hand, Prime Minister Trudeau was from Quebec, and there was a very strong representation at the federal level from Quebec, so there is another argument that can be made on that.

Again with respect to the myth of rejection, with Meech Lake Quebec made an offer, came forward with, as I say, the most modest set of proposals in living memory, and the rest of the country examined it, debated it, resisted it and finally turned it down. When you listen to the way people talk in Quebec—a slap in the face, a humiliating rejection, and so on—it is very directly linked to what we were talking about before, the idea that now Quebec is waiting for binding offers from the rest of Canada. I think the image there is of people who have been rejected, and they say: "Well, we're not going to go and do this again. You come to us this time. You make us a proposal, and we're going to be the last in. We are not going to be the first in with whatever arrangements are made."

The myth in this sense is not that it is false. Most myths are ways a society looks at itself and, I think, are half true. They are perceptions, ways of interpreting the past, ways of understanding the present, but their existence at the heart of our debate is central.

What I am getting at is—and it seems to me important in looking at the real problem and looking at real options—that one has to think, to what extent are we dealing with symbolic conflict, or a conflict that is working itself out at the symbolic level, and to what extent are we dealing with substantive, concrete problems, shoes pinching someplace that need to have a shoemaker adjust them?

My own perception is that there are both of those dimensions present, but in fact, when push comes to shove, I would say that the symbolic or mythological side of it is more important than the substantive.

Having said that, I guess my final comment would be, to the extent that is true, the more the symbolic dimension is at the core of it, the more difficult it is to resolve, not the easier. If you look at the Meech Lake experience, people in the rest of the country outside of Quebec at the beginning criticized every clause in Meech Lake when it started to be discussed. There was hardly a single word in the Meech Lake agreement that was not attacked by somebody. When you got to the end of the process, it started to get quite simple. At least, this is my perception.

In Quebec, the test element in this was the "distinct society" clause. Would it be accepted or would it not? In the rest of the country there were increasing concerns about that "distinct society" provision and what it meant, and whether it was an appropriate way of representing the

association in this country and so on. What we were doing was dealing substantially with this symbolic dimension.

My concluding observation would be that it does seem to me that in looking at realistic ways of finding a path through these difficulties, it is important to bear in mind both the symbolic and the substantive dimension, and always, when one looks at specific concrete proposals for reform, to pass that through the symbolic net as well as the substantial net. Are we effectively satisfying some of the sense of grievance that exists as well as dealing with some concrete problems that have been specified?

The Chair: Thank you very much. Before I open for questions, let me just be clear, Mr Bredt. Are there any other parts to the presentation, or is that it?

Mr Bredt: That is it.

The Chair: Okay. I am just conscious of the time, and I want to make sure we got everything.

Dr Cameron: That should surely be enough.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Cameron, I just want to make a couple of observations before I ask my question. It is only lately that I am beginning personally to understand the significance of the choice of "National Assembly" as the title of the Legislature of Quebec, and I really feel somehow I am finally understanding what that means.

Another personal observation that I have, I just wish that much that is being said by all of us now, certainly by those who are not even in government, could have been said last year. It would just have been so good to have gone into June 1990 with the kind of background and discussion we have had in 1991. Those things were not possible.

I find what you say, though you did not have the humour that you promised, quite uplifting, and I wonder if you feel—and you certainly have a lot more interaction with people across the country than we do, or than I personally do for sure—that what you have said is being talked about. I think it is so significant that you are suggesting there really is the tool, that it really is not constitutional as such in the same way that many of us understand it to be.

I think the word "constitutional" is used by a lot of us because we know it is important. The word "Constitution" puts it at a new level of discussion, and it somehow puts it into another arena that we hope—and I am saying this with certainly a lack of vocabulary—the important people can fix up. If it is something else, then who fixes it up? I am being extremely simplistic, but I am trying to understand what you said, and I have a feeling that you have capsuled the real crux of the matter, and I congratulate you for that.

Could you say a little bit about how widely accepted what you have said is, or do you know that?

Dr Cameron: It would be my perception that what I am calling—I do not know if these are the right words—the symbolic dimension to this debate is not that well understood or not that much paid attention to in the debate, either in Quebec or outside of Quebec. One of the most interesting essays on this is by a fellow called Christian Dufour, entitled *The Quebec Challenge*. It is quite different in its analysis from almost anything else that I have seen, and it focuses very much on that issue. I think this is an extremely difficult dimension of a conflict to wrestle with, to capture, to

deal with and even to recognize, because you tend to live within your own world of symbols and understandings.

We are taught our history. That is real as far as you are concerned, and unless you are an expert in the field, you may not be at all aware of the fact that the terminology used in Quebec is different and the image of the event is different. It is fairly obvious that the conquest is a profound event in Quebec society. I think less and less is something people spend their time thinking about in English-speaking Canada. For example, a political scientist who was a Quebecker gave a speech at the University of Toronto and chose as his title "The Consequences of Meech Lake Overcoming the Conquest and Lord Durham." You just think about that. What kind of historical reference points would English-speaking Canadians use in trying to address this sort of thing? I do not think it is very well understood. We all live within our own world, and then we pass these miscommunications back and forth, so it seems to me that is a very big challenge.

As I look at the situation we are confronted with now, I think there is a serious risk that we will look at this situation as requiring a package deal. That is what we did in 1982: a big, complex group of changes all at once. That is what we tried to do at Meech Lake, and if we are not very careful, I think we may end up having another run at that in that fashion. The more that one can turn this issue into one that can be addressed by a process, not by a single massive act of creation, the better off we are going to be, so if there are ways over the coming winter in which one can offer some specific, very limited constitutional changes, it seems to me that would be desirable. If there are ways in which you can begin to deal with non-constitutional problems this country is facing and show that the country can move and can change, that also is desirable.

1800

In that area, a massive change in the federal system is already under way whether we like it or not. The federal government's capping of the transfers for health and education—by about the middle of this decade Quebec will come out the other end; there will be no more federal dollars coming for health in Quebec. The way in which the federal government has established standards nationally in the health care field has been by the power of the purse. We are already close to facing that issue anyway.

I think if the federal government showed some interest in a major review of how one copes with this problem and looks for ways in which the provinces can take over full control of these areas but in the context of some commitment to national standards, it is not a constitutional issue as such, but it is a very big issue of policy reform.

Mr Bisson: It is an excellent observation, because you are perfectly right in saying that. A lot of this stuff is actually non-constitutional, more in regard to laws and regulations at the federal level. It is a good observation.

Mr Winner: I appreciated your analogies to the cow trail and footwear. I think the two have something in common for the purposes of our constitutional direction, because when you are following a cow trail, you have to watch your footwear and how you step.

I can think of some ways in which the exercise is more than largely symbolic: for example, native right to self-government, which is not entrenched in our Constitution and depends so much on the political will of the particular province in how it is observed or, another instance, a concern with the "notwithstanding" clause. I know you were a little facetious when you put forward your heretical proposition, but are these not more than largely symbolic, more than minor adjustments in the way we fine-tune our Constitution?

Dr Cameron: In the present circumstances it is clearly a romantic view. The Constitution is the most fundamental document in the land. The reason it is difficult to change is that very reason. It seems to me there ought to be some discipline in the system so that we do not leap immediately to, "We've got a problem, so let's change the Constitution."

I think this is a worrisome trend in Canadian society. One of the difficulties it creates is it loads on to the Constitution a whole bunch of things that may not necessarily have to be there or are only there properly in part. Sure, there are areas where we need to address constitutional problems, but to some extent my concern is that it relieves the pressure on constitutional issues sometimes or shifts

the focus to constitutional issues. Given that they are the most difficult things to bring off—we have demonstrated that by not succeeding with Meech Lake; it takes us a long time to make any changes; the amending formula was up for discussion for 20 or 30 years—it seems to me that just as a matter of common sense we ought to be putting a whole lot of effort into the areas which are easier to change and do not require constitutional amendment, which is not to say that constitutional amendments in some specific areas are not required; they clearly are.

I recognize that we are now into a constitutional discourse where the major conflicts in the country are going to have to have a constitutional resolution among other resolutions to them. I just think that is the way it is structured. But it does seem to me it is important to bear this whole other dimension in mind.

The Chair: Thank you very much for coming and spending some time with us. It has helped to refocus our thoughts somewhat.

We are adjourned until next week.

The committee adjourned at 1805.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 12 June 1991

Organization	C-1135
Continued in camera	C-1138
Afternoon sitting	C-1139
Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs	C-1139
Adjournment	C-1153

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
 Curling, Alvin (Scarborough North L)
 Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Gigantes, Evelyn (Ottawa Centre NDP)
 Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
 Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
 Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
 Mathysen, Irene (Ms)(Middlesex NDP)
 Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
 O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa-Rideau L)
 Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Clerk: Brown, Harold

Staff:

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Service
 Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Service

045640017

FEB 26 1992

3 1761 1146603 5

